DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 396 PS 014 063

AUTHOR Jump, Teresa Layne
TITLE Dual-Career Families: The Interfaces of Work, Family and the Home.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 118p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); *Coping; Day Care; Decision Making; *Dual Career Family; Early Childhood Education; Employed Women; *Family Characteristics; Fathers; Futures (of Society); *Interpersonal Relationship; *Parent Role; Social Change; Socialization; Social Support Groups; *Work Environment

ABSTRACT

This extensive discussion provides an examination of issues concerning dual-career families in the United States. Section I explores changes in the paid labor force and factors contributing to such changes. Section II discusses sex stratification in the family and briefly points out changes needed to strengthen the interface between work and family systems. Section III focuses on interfaces between work and family, family work patterns, and the characteristics and significance of the dual-career family. Section IV discusses dual-career husband/wife relationships in terms of family role theory, power and decision making, marital adjustment, rewards and gains, and childless marriages. Section V explores aspects of parental roles in dual-career families, describing childhood socialization, division of labor in the home, employed mothers, "the Renaissance of fathering," and strains within families. Section VI describes coping strategies, specifically considering employment, day care, and social supports. The final section, section VII, envisions the future of dual-career families. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242396

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or orgcnization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DUAL-CAREER FAMILIES: THE INTERFACES OF WORK, FAMILY AND THE HOME

Teresa Layne Jump

Indiana University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Teresa L. Jump

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 014003

This paper is submitted for the fulfillment of the requirements for the written qualifying exams in Early Childhood Education and Family Life Studies.

Table of Contents

Outline.....iii

Trends.....1

Changes in the Paid Labor Force.....1

Factors Contributing to Change.....3

Problem.....7

Sex Stratification in the Family.....7

Changes Needed.....10

Work and Family.....11

Interfaces of Work and Family.....11

Family Work Patterns.....12

The Dual-Career Family.....15

Dual-Career Husband-Wife Relationships.....18

Family Role Theory.....18

Power and Decision-Making.....22

Marital Adjustment.....27

Rewards and Gains.....31

Childless Dual-Career Marriages.....32

Parental Roles in Dual-Career Families.....35

Childhood Socialization.....35

Division of Labor in the Home.....44

Employed Mothers.....50

The Renaissance of Fathering.....55

Strains on Dual Career Families.....60

Coping Strategies for Dual-Career Families.....64
Strategies.....64
Employment Considerations.....68
Day-Care.....73
Social Supports.....76
Dual-Career Families and the Future.....79
A Charge for the Future.....79
References.....85

Outline

I. Trends

A. Changes in the Paid Labor Force

1. Female Employment

2. History of Female Labor

3. Decreasing the Gap

4. Maternal Employment

B. Factors Contributing to Change

1. Declining Birth Rate

2. Declining Fertility Rate

3. Educational Attainment

4. Expanded Opportunities

5. Women's Movement

6. Conclusion

II. Problem

A. Sex Stratification in the Family

1. Division of Labor

2. Women's "Double-Bind"

3. Father's Role

4. Childhood Socialization

B. Changes Needed

III. Work and Family

A. Interfaces of Work and Family

1. "Myth of Separate Worlds"

2. Family System's Approach

3. The Workplace

B. Family-Work Patterns

1. Types

2. Jobs vs. Careers

3. Two-Person Career

C. The Dual-Career Family

1. Characteristics

2. Significance

IV. Dual-Career Husband-Wife Relationships

A. Family Role Theory

1. Marital Role Relationship

2. Parsons' Theory

3. Criticism and Challenges

B. Power and Decision-Making

1. Power

2. Resource Power

3. Homemaker's Secondary Status

4. Decision-Making

5. Working Wives

C. Marital Adjustment

1. Sources of Strain

2. Wife's Accommodation

3. Marital Satisfaction

4. Conclusion

D. Rewards and Gains

1. Financial Gains

2. Wife's Rewards

3. Husband's Rewards

E. Childless Dual-Career Marriages

1. Characteristics

2. Incidence of Voluntary Childlessness

3. Consequences

V. Parental Roles in Dual-Career Families

A. Childhood Socialization

1. Parental Role Models

2. Definitions

3. Sex Role Theories

4. Psychoanalytic Model

5. Social Learning Theory

6. Cognitive Developmental Theory

7. Psychological Androgyny Theory

8. Family's Role

9. Dual-Career Parents

B. Division of Labor in the Home

1. Sex Stratification
2. A New Perspective
3. Origin of Division of Labor
4. Myth of Greater Equalization
5. Women's Work
6. Men's Work
7. Women's Two Shifts
8. Psycho-sociological Factors
9. Overcommitted Wives
10. Domestic Services

C. Employed Mothers

1. Myth of Motherhood
2. Motherhood and Employment
3. Effects of Maternal Employment
4. Conclusion

D. The Renaissance of Fathering

1. Secondary Status
2. The Traditional Perspective
3. Changing Images
4. The Benefits of Father
5. Emancipation of Man

E. Strains on Dual-Career Families

1. "Superwoman"

2. Theories of Role Strain

3. Implications

VI. Coping Strategies for Dual-Career Families

A. Strategies

1. Coping Behavior Within the Family

2. Role Sharing

B. Employment Considerations

1. Job-Revolution

2. Employee Benefits

3. More Part-Time Work

4. Job-Sharing Opportunities

5. Flexible Work Schedules

6. Child-Care

7. Family Counseling

8. Relocation Assistance

9. Family Leaves

10. Revitalization

C. Day-Care

1. Critical Shortage

2. Low Priority

3. Politics

4. Corporate Day-Care

5. Women's Issue

D. Social Supports

1. Definition

2. Social Networks

3. Dilemmas

4. Resolutions

VII. Dual-Career Families and the Future

A. A Charge for the Future

1. Optimistic

2. Symmetrical Families

3. Sex Roles

4. Parenting and Child-Care

5. Institutions

6. The Workplace

7. Conclusion

DUAL-CAREER FAMILIES: THE INTERFACES OF WORK, FAMILY AND THE HOME

Trends

Changes in the Paid Labor Force

Female Employment. In the United States today, it is no longer accurate to think of the typical family as one in which the husband is the breadwinner and the wife remains home with the children. Indeed, one of the most clearly documented changes in the American family is the dramatic increase in rates of participation of women in the workforce, outside the home. For the first time in history, working wives (those in the paid labor force) outnumber housewives. Today, in over half of all American families, both husband and wife work (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980).

History of Female Labor. Historically, women have always worked. The distinction of work, being defined as "paid labor" is relatively new (Smuts, 1974). During most of the nineteenth century, the United States was still predominantly rural and agricultural. For most men and women, their work was an unpaid contribution to sustaining the family. "Like farm women throughout history, they rose before the sun and spent their days as active partners in the family's common work. Just what they did depended on the kind of farm, its income, what other members of the family could do, the customs of the locality and many other circumstances" (Smuts, 1974, p6).

However, the twentieth century brought an Industrial Revolution to America, producing a nation of cities, factories, and workers disengaged from their homes. During this period, women continued to produce much of the food, clothing and other necessities consumed by their families. Many of them took on paid work which they could perform without leaving home. The small percentage of women who worked outside the home were single, divorced or widowed. At the turn of the century, the Bureau of Labor's study of women factory workers in large cities found that three fourths of them were under twenty-five, and only four percent were married. Three out of four were foreign born or of foreign parentage. One-third of the two million widowed women were then gainfully employed outside the home (U.S. Commissioner of Labor, 1900).

Decreasing the Gap. Since 1900, the gap has lessened considerably between men's and women's paid work patterns. The appearance of married women marks a decided break with tradition. The labor force participation rate of married women in the U.S. more than doubled from 1900 to 1940; and then doubled again from 1940 to 1960; and since 1960 has risen from 30.1% to 51% in 1980 (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1980). Various analysts have shown that this change has been accompanied by decreased, full-time labor force participation rates for men. Between 1950 and 1980, men's work rate fell from 87% to 77% and it is predicted that it may fall to about 70% by 1990 (Newland, 1980).

Maternal Employment. Moreover, the 1980 U.S. Census revealed the most substantial increase in workforce participation for women, appears greatest for married women with young children. "For the school-aged child, there is more than one chance in two that a mother will be employed. For a child between the ages of three and five, there is close to one chance in two. And, during a child's infancy and toddlerhood, the chance is one in three the mother will be employed" (Women's Bureau, 1977). It has been predicted that by 1990, there will be 23.3 million preschool-age children and 10.4 million or about 45% will have employed mothers (Hofferth, 1979). This change is "one of the most significant phenomenons of the twentieth century", for it represents a dramatic departure from the ideal, traditional family (Ginzberg, 1979).

Factors Contributing to Change

Declining Birth Rate. There are several factors that have been identified as contributing to the increase of women into the paid labor force. The most significant one being "the decline in the importance of biological sex differences" (Haas, 1977). Once women spent most of their adult years bearing, nursing and raising children. Today, "the average American woman spends only one-third of her life raising the average of two children" (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1979). The birth rate has declined from approximately 23-25 per 1000 in the 1950's, to 15 per 1000 in 1974, which has meant smaller families and a

shorter period in which the family is producing children (Whitehurst, 1977).

Declining Fertility Rate. Fertility expectations of women also have dropped dramatically since the 1950's. In 1955, 38% of women ages 18-24, expected to have four or more children, compared to only 8% in 1974 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975). In this decade, most couples anticipate only two children. In addition, women today have a much longer life expectancy, with 25-30 years of life after their last child has grown. In 1900, their grandmother's life expectancy was only 48.7 years, never reaching the "empty-nest" years of their life span (Whitehurst, 1977).

Lower fertility rates have been associated with effective and widely practiced contraception methods, the current economic recession, concern with overpopulation, the delay of marriage and children until later adult years, increased educational attainment, and a correlation between fertility and wife's employment (Ewer, Crimmins and Oliver, 1979; Hoffman, 1978; Swartz, 1980; Haas, 1977). The birth of a child today is far more likely to be planned, timed and predictable.

Educational Attainment. Another important factor related to the increase of women into the paid labor force is that of changes in women's educational attainment. Over the past 35 years, there has been a well-known rise in the educational attainment of the entire U.S. population; but women have had

the most dramatic effect upon the composition of the student population in higher education. Women have always been more likely to finish high school than men, but since 1970 they have entered institutions of higher education in record-breaking numbers.

Between 1970 and 1974, the number of women in college increased by 30% and estimates approaching 50% describe the significant increase at present. "Evidence also exists that fewer women are abandoning their educational plans upon marriage or childbearing...and the trend may be seen in the sheer numbers of women 25 years and older who are in school today" (Van Dusen and Sheldon, 1976). Furthermore, the proportion of women in graduate school continues to rise, although overall graduate school enrollment has dropped.

Expanded Opportunities. As a result of Title IX, affirmative action laws and expanded entry opportunities into traditionally male professions, women presently make up high proportions of professional schools. Fields such as law, medicine, architecture, business and engineering, once closed to women, now have 20-30% female graduates. The increasing proportion of women in the first-year class of these programs suggests that these trends will continue (McCarthy and Wolfe, 1975; Parrish, 1974).

In addition to increased opportunities in traditionally male-dominated occupations, the demand for female labor power

has also expanded in recent years. "The industries and occupations that have grown most rapidly since 1940 are those that were the major employers of women. This trend has been characterized as a shift from the goods-producing economy prior to World War II to the service-producing economy of the 1970's" (Waldman and Whitmore, 1974). The post World War II baby boom and the Great Society programs of the 1960's created the need for an expansion of a wide variety of services. These services (e.g., educational, medical, governmental, recreational and sociological) are mostly represented by women because of continuing occupational segregation. The emergence of light manufacturing and computer technology has also played a role in attracting women to new occupations.

Women's Movement. Finally, the Women's Movement must be mentioned as a major force behind the increase of women into the arena of paid labor. After lying dormant since the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, an interest in women's rights was reborn in the early 1960's. The Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War, broad social changes, rapid technological development, awareness of family problems and social inequities and the release of Betty Friedan's (1963) powerful book, The Feminine Mystique, all contributed to a rebirth of feminist ideology. The Women's Movement became an advocate for women's rights, fighting sexism, stereotypes, oppression, sex discrimination and sexual harrassment. Whether

it has officially gained the status of "a social movement" or not, the Women's Movement propelled both legal and political changes and raised the consciousness of the grass roots of the American population.

Conclusion. "You've come a long way baby" expresses one idea of women's improved status and indicates change. "And change is what has characterized women's lives during the last half-century and especially the past twenty years" (Swartz, 1980). That "change" in women's lives has had a monumental effect on the American family.

> Women today are less constrained by their sex in educational, occupational, marital and childbearing options. A woman may marry or not. She may bear children or not. If she plans to have a family, a woman will probably have her first child later than her mother did, and she will probably have fewer children. She is more likely to have to raise her child alone. She is more likely to work outside the home (Swartz, 1980).

Problem

Sex Stratification in the Family

Division of Labor. The trends toward greater opportunities and participation in the paid labor force of women have not been matched by an increased involvement of men in the home. Despite the undeniable gains made by women in the last twenty years, the traditional family role differentiation has been kept intact. The female still has the key responsibility

for child-care and homemaking. The research literature points out "that the wife's employment has a negligible impact on the husband's housework and child-care responsibilities" (La Rossa and La Rossa, 1981; Berk and Berk, 1979; Bird, 1979; Eversoll, 1979; Holmstrom, 1972; Lein, 1979; Pleck and Rustad, 1980; Sawin and Parke, 1979; Tognoli, 1979; Robinson, 1977; Whitehurst, 1977). Employed women spend twice as much time in primary child-care as men and work approximately seventy hours per week (Robinson, 1977; Gauger, 1973). "In short, women have taken on a second task without having discarded their homemaking task and in fact, while still maintaining the clear primacy of the homemaking task" (Reiss, 1980).

Women's "Double-Bind". It is commonly observed today that homemaking and child-care responsibilities assigned to women add to the difficulties of pursuing a career, especially in terms of time, energy and role conflicts. This presents a double-bind phenomenon for women who combine work and family. They must function in two "activity systems" where the allocation of time and resources are a problem and often there is a conflict of values--career commitments versus family responsibilities (Coser and Rokoff, 1974; Lieber, 1980). "This double-bind obligation is probably the largest barrier to sex equality today, for by accepting it, women accept a special place and a special role" (Janeway, 1971).

Father's Role. Society also assigns a cultural mandate to its males--that of the family breadwinner. A man's key life role is his occupation, not marriage and childrearing. "Nowhere are the statistics to be found on children of working fathers. We keep tabs on working mothers because they, and not working fathers, pose a social dilemma: after all if women work, who will take care of the children? 'Working mothers' signals an inherent conflict of commitment; 'working fathers' is a redundancy" (Levine, 1977). Fatherhood is changing though and many men do not want to repeat their fathers' absenteeism. Whether they are prodded by working wives, divorces, unemployment or simply searcning for closer relationships with their children, many fathers today are questioning their ascribed family role and searching for better parenting alternatives.

Childhood Socialization. The origin of society's sex role expectations, which contribute so significantly to women's family/work role-conflict and to men's alienation from the family are deep and pervasive. The process of childhood socialization teaches gender role expectations and behaviors beginning at birth. Parents' interaction and play with their newborn infants, along with the stereotypic colored accessories, clothing and toys, reveal the different early experiences for young boys and girls. These patterns are duplicated and reinforced throughout childhood. Little girls grow up

learning to be "mommies" while their brothers acquire the necessary skills for the world of work.

Changes Needed

The problems associated with work, parents and children are deeply rooted "within childrearing patterns, institutionalized sex-typed practices related to schools, industry and the professions, and in popular culture" (Schwartz, 1980). Changes that have been recommended to strengthen the interface between work and family systems are: the integration of a more flexible, androgynous sex role; the commitment of both parents to provide for the physical, cognitive, emotional and social well-being of their children; the provision of social support networks, i.e., day-care, counseling services, parent education programs; the implementation of employment considerations for parent and the family, i.e., flexible work schedules, parental leaves, equal employment and pay opportunities; and the development of a national family policy, social legislation and change (Bem, 1978; Defrain, 1979; Lein, 1979; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1972; Scanzoni and Scanzoni, 1976; Safilios-Rothschild, 1972; Moore, 1978; Reiss, 1980; Schwartz, 1980; Harrangue, 1980; Haas, 1980).

Work and Family

Interfaces of Work and Family

"Myth of Separate Worlds". In recent years there has been heightened interest among social and behavioral scientists, educators, business leaders and feminists, concerning the interfaces of work and family life. Because of the increased employment of women, the new emphasis in psychology on the total life cycle, the renaissance of fathering, the cost effectiveness of day-care and other social supports, researchers are now breaking down the "myth of separate worlds" (Kanter, 1977; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1965, 1971; Renshaw, 1976). "Modern industrial society has viewed work and family life as two separate and non-overlapping worlds, with their own functions, territories, and behavioral rules" (Kanter, 1977).

Family System's Approach. In considering the "myth of separate worlds", it is important to change the assumption and conceptualization of the family as a separate study of whole families to the study of the family as an active social system (Hill, 1974; Kantor and Lehr, 1975).

> This approach implies that a family cannot be understood merely as a collection of individuals. Rather, it is a social group, continuous in time, composed of interdependent roles and people who interact according to implicit rules of psychological and social interaction. Individuals and interpersonal groupings, with their own histories and concerns, are subsystems within the larger system. A systems approach is useful because it

> forces us to look at what occurs among people as well as within them, and to search for coherent dynamic processes. Both the clinical research and theory on families have contributed to our understanding of the importance of microinteractional processes in families and the ways in which they facilitate or hinder the formation of personal identity and positive interpersonal relationships (Piotrikowski, 1979).

The Workplace. Work organizations also require a systems theory approach and represent one type of social system in which families are linked. By conceptualizing the family as a social system, which implies the interdependence of systems parts, it offers a view of the family worker(s) as intimately connected to others (Piotrikowski, 1979). Therefore, workplace stressors, expectations, relations and support systems affecting the worker(s), may also affect other family members. Family systems also act upon the workplace, creating pressure to change and to facilitate both systems in a more humane, interdependent relationship. The research literature reminds us "that it is important to examine work both inside and outside the home, the interconnections between these two systems, and the ways they touch the psycho-social relations of family members" (Piotrikowski, 1979).

Family-Work Patterns

Types. In order to develop an understanding of the interfaces between work and family, the basic types of family-work patterns need to be analyzed. Researchers have repeatedly

categorized marriages or families working in the paid labor force the following ways: 1) dual-career workers; 2) dual non-career workers for both mates; 3) dual combination of career and non-career workers (Reiss, 1980). It has been argued that these distinctions are worth making in order to study the interrelationships between work and family effectively.

Jobs vs. Careers. The term career has often been used to indicate any kind of work, especially denoting men's jobs. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) in a definition that has become widely accepted in the dual-career literature, define "career" as "those jobs which are highly salient, have a developmental sequence, and require a high degree of commitment." The Rapoports give examples of careers within large organizations which progress through posts leading upward in some kind of heirarchy; careers in professions which proceed through stages of cultivations and experience, accumulating expertise. Careers can be sought at the technical, managerial or entrepreneurial level.

"Work, as distinct from career, may involve any kind of gainful employment" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). "An occupation that is non-career involves less commitment and less loyalty" (Reiss, 1980). It has been pointed out that "jobs are

subject to interruption and lack clear developmental stages and accumulation of expertise" (Hunt and Hunt, 1977). Most families with both spouses in the workforce fit into the "dual-wage earner", "dual non-career worker" or "dual-worker" pattern (Reiss, 1980; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). The vast majority of men's and women's jobs are not career-type and are taken for purely economic reasons.

Two-Person Career. Another family-work pattern which remains a common alternative for many families in America is the "two-person career" (Papenek, 1973), in which both husband and wife participate in the single career of one spouse (usually the male's). This traditional model lends itself easily to raising young children and furthering the advancement of one family career. While both spouses are heavily involved and committed to one career, in our society it is the wife who has the auxiliary role in the husband's career development. The husband's (worker) achievement and success is direct, while the wife derives hers from vicarious identification with his career status. "The prototype of the two-person career is that of the corporate executive and his wife, though the military, academic and high level professional man likewise depends on having a 'wife' to furnish the support system he needs for the advancement of his career" (Williams, 1980).

The Dual-Career Family

The dual-career family represents a variant pattern of family-work life and is becoming an increasingly prevalent lifestyle today. The dual-career family is one in which both heads of household pursue careers and at the same time maintain a family life together (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). The "dual-career" marriage was first coined and studied by the Rapoports in 1969 and has also been referred to as the "two-career" family (Holmstrom, 1972). The dual-career family is defined in terms of the simultaneous participation of spouses in careers. Women in these marriages have continuous work patterns, interrupting their work only minimally for childbirth. It has been estimated that there are approximately three million married couples today with dual-careers (Rice, 1979).

Characteristics. Although dual-career families and dual-worker families share much in common, their backgrounds and personal characteristics are quite different. Dual-career wives differentiate more from other wives than their respective husbands. The following features of childhood background have been found significant among dual-career wives: 1) The first striking feature of these wives is the high proportion who are "only" or the eldest child in their family of origin. 2) Proportionately more dual-career wives come from a relatively high social class, as indicated by fathers' occupations.

3) Their mothers' occupational experience and attitudes are important for these women. The wives often have mothers who enjoyed working outside the home or mothers who were frustrated housewives. 4) In family composition, a very high proportion had no other adults or relatives outside the immediate family living within their childhood home. 5) Another major feature of the childhood of the dual-career wives is the relatively high degree of tension within the family, particularly with the father-daughter relationship. 6) These wives also tend to experience longer periods of separation from parents during childhood or miscellaneous disturbances (e.g., uprooted from homes, frequent moving). 7) A high level of educational attainment was a significant variable for these dual-career women. 8) They also tend to have pro-feminist attitudes toward the roles of women. 9) Lastly, dual-career wives are employed because they enjoy their work and find it personally fulfilling (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Bebbington, 1973; Rallings and Nye, 1979; Houseknecht and Macke, 1981; Holmstrom, 1972; Peplau, 1976; Houser and Beckman, 1980).

Researchers found little difference on the average between the childhood backgrounds of dual-career husbands and those of the husbands in dual-worker and traditional marriages. The only two contrasting charateristics were that dual-career husbands: tend to retain close ties with their mothers and

families (a feature that must have originated in childhood) (Bebbington, 1973); and they tend to come from families in which, if there were other children, the others were girls (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). It is of considerable interest that differences in backgrounds are so much more emphatic for wives, than for husbands.

Significance. Dual-career families are more than of private interest. This combined career-family pattern expresses both in structure and in value one variant emerging in our post-industrial society which is adapting to contemporary social change and the strains inherent in family-work relationships. It has been suggested that this family-work pattern will become a more pervasive model for the future. Thus, the dual-career family has been identified by social-scientists as a social unit engaged in a microscopic experiment with social change (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1972; Trist, 1968; Goode, 1963; Bell, 1968; and Reiss, 1980).

Dual-career families are working out patterns of living together in relation to their network of relationships. Their lifestyle is without clear social precedent. "Because each family unit functions in a larger cultural system of norms and values and in a larger social system of relationships and interactions, the innovating patterns which are attempted by dual-career families may be seen as going 'against the grain' of society in various ways" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1972). As

innovating models, these families mandate structural changes in the areas of social organization of work, domestic role relationships and the "built environment" (Bell, 1970).

Researchers continue to point out the significance of the dual-career model, operating in a social system that does not support it and provides powerful counter beliefs, making it difficult to adopt. These career couples are unusually visible and articulate and they provide society with exemplary models of families who incorporate untraditional parental roles and employment. They represent a search for new alternatives and options to gain a different kind of fulfillment. "The dual-career phenomenon underscores the notion that family members can direct their lives based on options and not rely just on tradition...They have been described as the 'enabling family' (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1978) attesting to the desire to break out of stereotypic roles so that family members may actively strive for personal accomplishment" (Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980).

Dual-Career Husband-Wife Relationships

Family Role Theory

Marital Role Relationship. "Marriage has been treated primarily as a role relationship in which duties, obligations, rights and perquisites have been assigned to the man-husband and woman-wife along structured lines" (Rapoport, 1978). The function of this role relationship has been discussed by social

theorists since the nineteenth century. During America's Industrial Revolution, writers of the day criticized the changing economic and social functions of the family and prophesied its demise as an institution. Pre-industrial society had been predominantly rural and one where family life and work life were the same. These families were isolated from each other, sustaining their own family unit by producing food, clothing, shelter, a workplace and often serving as "a church, reformatory, school and asylum" (Hareven, 1976). With increasing industrialization and urbanization, these functions were given to local shops and other agencies and the family unit became very specialized. Social theorists became concerned that the family had lost its traditional functions.

Parsons' Theory. In the late 1940's, a Harvard sociologist, Talcott Parsons, developed one of the most influential theories on the functionality of the conventional family (1949). Parsons and his colleagues, Bales (1955) and Zelditch (1955) emphasized the strengths of the nuclear family in the context of modern urban society. They maintained "that although traditional family was changed by industrial society, the new structure that was emerging provided a stable family environment in which to prepare children for their adult roles in society and to maintain the psychological balance of the men who faced the pressures of competition in their work life" (Parsons, 1954). Parsons' work concentrated on the model

pattern of a "normal American family--a middle-class urban couple with young children and reduced kin ties" (Parsons and Bales, 1955).

While experimenting with Bales' small-group dynamics model, Parsons and Bales (1955) formulated a theory on role differentiation in small groups and assumed it applied to family roles. They believed there was a need for specialization in the family unit and that involved an "instrumental leader"--the father (e.g., holding the power to make decisions, solve problems, discipline children, and being the chief breadwinner) and required the mother to be the "expressive leader" (e.g., taking care of emotional needs, providing support for the breadwinner, nurturing the home and children, and being the primary caregiver). Parsons argued that sex role segregation is a functional necessity for marital stability and the two complementary roles, presumably enhance marital harmony. He maintained that because the marriage relationship is structurally unsupported in an urban industrial society, it is fragile and easily disrupted without protective mechanisms (1949). Since women were supposed to be confined to the home, Parsons' sex role segregation viewed them as preventing disruptive competition to their spouse. Instead, Parsons (1949, 1955) emphasized the female's role was to be primarily a source of emotional support for the family and her employed-husband in an urban, hostile world.

Zelditch (1955) extended the theory to his cross-cultural research and found that forty-six of the fifty-six societies he studied did fit into this theory of role differentiation. The ideas of Parsons, Bales, and Zelditch remain widely popular today and underlie society's prescribed roles for men and women in the family.

Criticism and Challenges. Today's social and behavioral scientists are challenging Parsons and colleagues' role differentiation theory and questioning their research procedures (Reiss, 1980; Rapoport, 1978; LeMasters, 1970; Stockard and Johnson, 1980; Oppenheimer, 1977; Rossi, 1968; Theodore, 1971; Barth and Watson, 1967). Parsons and his colleagues overlooked the need for both mothers and fathers to be involved in the instrumental and expressive areas of family living. Mothers are faced daily with decisions, problem solving, disciplining children and often are required to work out of economic necessity. Fathers are expected to help their wives manage tensions and give emotional care and support to family members. Whether the theory's architects realized it or not, their model had a "built-in static quality and disregarded diversity and variations in human beings and thus in family life" (Rapoport, 1978).

The dual-career family represents an adaptive unit in the stratification system coping with the interfaces of work and

family life. Dual-career and dual-worker families are examples of the invalidity of Parsons' theory and provide grounds for the revision of this model. The dual-career literature emphasizes that non-traditional paths may involve the development of new family structures that are more adaptive to the needs of mothers and fathers as people than are the traditional role models (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Holmstrom, 1972; Lein et al., 1974; Poloma and Garland, 1980; Martin, Berry and Jacobsen, 1975).

Power and Decision-Making

The study of power and decision-making in contemporary families has been a major topic in the marriage and family literature for the past two decades. Researchers have explored and compared the dual-career couple with dual-worker and traditional families to see if significant differences surface in their marital relationships. Family studies on power and decision-making have been criticized and controversial because of research methodology, inconsistent and poor definitions of concepts and biases or difficulties in the measurements. While the findings of these studies (the sheer number of studies is overwhelming) should be viewed with caution and skepticism, it is still useful to draw some conclusions from them in order to better understand the relationships of the dual-career couple.

Power. Drawing from the work of several family scholars, the concept of power has been broadly defined "as the ability or potential of an individual within a social relationship to carry out his/her will, even in the face of resistance to others" (McDonald, 1977, 1980; Burr, 1973; Cromwell and Olson, 1975; Rollins and Bahr, 1976; Scanzoni, 1979). "Power in this sense is not conceived as an attribute of an individual per se, but rather as a characteristic that can be measured between any two individuals who are interacting...Power may vary according to the particular situation and is not a fixed trait" (Reiss, 1980). Because the concept of power has been defined in so many different ways and used interchangeably with the concepts of the authority, influence and decision making, studies are difficult to compare (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970).

Resource Power. In a marital relationship, nine different types of power may be present (Safilios-Rothschild, 1976). One of these, "resource power" is ascribed to a person based on educational or occupational achievements. By virtue of such attainments, the individual can control certain scarce, desirable resources (e.g., income) necessary for the functioning of the relationship (Rice, 1979). Simply stated, the balance of power in marriage has often been found to be associated with that spouse who brings in more valued resources to the marriage (Haas, 1977; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Kandel and Lesser, 1972; Centers et al., 1971). Since money is an important resource in

marriage, several studies have found that when a wife is employed, her power and/or authority within the family increased. Thus, employed wives were in a better bargaining position to suggest or demand a more egalitarian marital role organization (Heer, 1963; Wolfe, 1959; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Blood, 1963, 1965; Scanzoni, 1970; Bahr, Bowerman and Gecas, 1974; Moore and Sawhill, 1976).

In traditional marriages, the husband generally has a greater degree of resource power than his wife (Rice, 1979). Non-working wives with young children have been found to have the least power, presumably because at this time they are most vulnerable and financially dependent (Bahr, 1974). Dual-career marriage differs from traditional marriage in that both partners contribute financially to the relationship and have a high degree of resource power. Thus, the dual-career wife is not totally dependent on her husband for financial support; nor does she have to remain in an unsatisfying marriage purely for financial reasons.

> The employment of women affects the power structure of the family by equalizing the resources of husbands and wives. A working wife's husband listens to her more, and she listens to herself more. She expresses herself and has more opinions. Instead of looking up into her husband's eyes and worshipping him, she levels with him, compromises on the issues at hand. Thus her power increases and, relatively speaking, the husband's falls (Blood, 1965).

Homemaker's Secondary Status. Time spent in the home has not been perceived as an equal contribution to the family resources. The husband's income is consistent with society's emphasis on market value (or monetary value) rather than on other ways of determining value. Marxist feminists point out that homemakers do indeed contribute to our capitalist economy by caring for children, husbands and the home. Because homemaking services are not considered to be a part of the U.S. gross national product (production of goods and services), housewives' services have only "use value" rather than "exchange value". One consequence of women's unpaid work in the home is that it makes them financially dependent on men and hence powerless and isolated in work that is not socially recognized. The housewife's role lies at the heart of women's secondary status (Weinbaum and Bridges, 1976; Secombe, 1974; Benston, 1977). Safilios-Rothschild (1976) states, "Unless...the sex structure changes so as to allow men and women equal access to income, status and power, husbands will have great advantage over their wives in the marital exchanges and the determination of family power."

Decision-Making. More research has been done in the area of decision-making, than on any other sphere of family power. As reported previously, studies on decision-making in the past have provided unreliable findings and have numerous theoretical

and methodological shortcomings. The concept of decision-making has been viewed as an "outcome" of power (Olson and Cromwell, 1975), implying a static finality. This conceptualization ignores the dynamic processes that result in outcomes. "To ask 'who decides what' in no way taps the intricacies of decision-making processes" (Scanzoni, 1979).

It has been suggested that the term decision-making be understood as an abstract construct which subsumes a variety of more concrete and measurable concepts (Scanzoni, 1979; Coleman, 1975). Thus, decision-making becomes a shorthand construct for these ongoing inherently linked processes: attraction (Blau, 1964; Fox, 1973; Ekeh, 1974); exchange rules (Ekeh, 1974); distributive justice; negotiation (Rubin and Brown, 1975); maximum joint profit (Kelley and Schenitzki, 1972; Scanzoni, 1975, 1978); power (Heath, 1976; Sprey, 1975); trust (Deutsch, 1973); communication (Deutsch, 1973; Brickman, 1974); conflict (Duke, 1976; Scanzoni, 1979; Deutsch, 1973; Blau, 1964); hostility (Homans, 1974); and violence (Steinmetz and Straus, 1974; Scanzoni and Scanzoni, 1976).

Working Wives. Generally speaking, the research above has found repeatedly that working wives exhibited the most power in the processes of family decision-making. Findings show that wives have the greatest power in family decision-making (which may or may not equal the husbands) when they are employed in prestigious work, are committed to it, and have greater incomes

than their husbands. Variables of educational attainment, monetary incomes and occupational prestige, increase the power of decision-making significantly for both males and females (Gillespie, 1972). Even in dual-career marriages where wives have the greatest bargaining and decision-making power, the scales are tipped and husbands make the most important family decisions (e.g., job location, what car to buy, house to purchase, decisions to have children) (Rice, 1979; Gillespie, 1971; Stockard and Johnson, 1980).

Marital Adjustment

Studies of dual-career marriages have shown a tendency for husbands and wives to deny continuing, disruptive marital conflict (Paloma, 1972; Hopkins and White, 1978). Various reasons for this have been discussed, (e.g., "to reduce cognitive dissonance surrounding the conflicting demands of job and family, and to avoid having to deal directly with perceived inequities in the relationship") (Rice, 1979). Focusing on marital adjustment and areas of conflict is not meant to exclude the numerous benefits of this lifestyle. These rewards will be discussed in the next section.

Sources of Strains. Although dual-career couples tend to deny marital adjustment problems i.e., conflict, cohesion, strain, sources of stress are inherent in their lifestyle. First of all, the separation and divorce rates for women who are highly educated (those with five or more years of college) are especially high. "In fact, their disruption rate is

exceeded only by those women who did not finish high school" (Houseknecht and Spanier, 1980). A woman's educational level is strongly associated with employment (Rallings and Nye, 1979) and both variables are significant determinants of marital adjustment (Houseknecht and Spanier, 1980; Glick and Norton, 1977). Other findings support the evidence that employed women are more apt to divorce if they have relatively high earnings (Ross and Sawhill, 1975) or high potential earnings (Cherlin, 1979). Researchers generally agree that the dual-career marriage is one with a high degree of risk (Rice, 1979; Berman, Sacks and Lief, 1975; Roslow and Rose, 1972).

Sources of strain characteristic to the dual-career family have been documented by social-scientists and marriage and family therapists since the 1960's. An overwhelming amount of research has been done in the area, but few steps have been taken to eliminate these sources of strain. The Rapoports (1969) have made a detailed inquiry into the "phenomenology of sources of strain" experienced by the dual-career partnership and were able to identify five characteristic dilemmas common to all dual-career couples. They are: overload, environmental sanctions, personal identity and self esteem, social network dilemmas, and dilemmas of multiple role-cycling. Each family varied in the extent to which each of the dilemmas were problematic.

Other sources of strain found in the lives of dual-career partners were: 1) conflicts between earlier and later norms, home and work expectations, ideals and feelings; 2) barriers of domestic isolation, sex role prejudices and stereotypes; and 3) problems such as the wife finding an appropriate job, getting a work situation with flexibility to accommodate domestic requirements, competing with members of the opposite sex (particularly if marriage partner was in the same field), keeping personal aspirations within limits that the marriage can tolerate, and arranging domestic help and child-care services (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1980; Holmstrom, 1972; Poloma, 1972; Garland, 1972; Thomson, 1980).

Wife's Accommodation. On the whole, these researchers and others have found that it is the wife of the dual-career partnership who is most affected by the sources of dilemmas, conflicts, barriers and problems. Mostly through the wife's accommodation were these sources of strain minimized. In almost all cases, she was willing to subordinate her career to that of her husband (Rice, 1979).

Marital Satisfaction. "Time and energy directed toward employment may reduce time and energy for marital companionship, especially when young children are present" (Thomson, 1980). Several studies report that husbands of employed wives are less satisfied with their marriages than husbands of

non-employed wives (Burke and Weir, 1976; Bahr and Day, 1976; Wright, 1978). However, other research has found no difference between the two groups (Scanzoni, 1970; Campbell et al., 1976; Staines et al., 1978). For the employed wife, findings again are inconsistent. Staines et al. (1978) report that there is a negative effect on a career wife's own marital adjustment and satisfaction. Alternative studies show that marital adjustment of dual-career wives is higher than that for non-working women (with equal educational levels) because of incongruence between role expectations and role performance (Campbell, 1976; St. John-Parsons, 1978). Likewise, Lewis and Spanier (1979) concluded, that marital quality seems to be related more to the congruence between role expectations of one spouse and the role performance of the other spouse, than to any specific pattern of family-work roles.

Conclusion. Using role theory (Turner, 1974) to theoretically integrate the contradictory findings on employment and marital adjustment, Houseknecht and Macke (1981) present results that indicate "that it is not employment per se that is important in determining marital adjustment but rather the extent to which family experiences accommodate the wife's employment." Factors of importance to dual-career wives are: having a supportive husband, sharing career relocations, freedom of childrearing responsiblities, sharing domestic chores and supportive kin networks.

Rewards and Gains

Aside from the intrinsic rewards that many dual-career couples have found in surviving and thriving on the dilemmas of their lifestyle, there are numerous gains in the end product.

Financial Gains. "The financial gains are more important than are frequently acknowledged...Dual-career families tend to emphasize the importance of having a relatively high income, because they have high standards for domestic living, child-care, clothing and transportation" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). In order to cope financially with purchasing the required products and services which sustain the dual-career family, a high income is a must. Also career couples indicate that the overloads and hectic lifestyle they function in daily, necessitate family leisure habits and holidays which may be relatively costly. Another financial gain is the security of having two incomes to fall back upon, in the case of possible disasters (e.g., unemployment, disabilities, death of spouse).

Wife's Rewards. However, as money is important to these career couples, the crucial element of reward is self-expression or self-realization (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980). For career wives, part of their personal identity is associated with their professional work role. The self-fulfillment, satisfaction and contentment they receive from their work provide them with the impetus to meet

the challenges and the double-binds of their chosen lifestyle. Interaction with co-workers, opportunities for creativity and a sense of competence have also been identified as positive outcomes of employment (Hoffman and Nye, 1974). "Though the particular jobs they do may represent compromises with their original idealized conceptions, in every case, they are realizing in major degrees what they really want to do and feel is worth doing as human beings, making full use of their capacities" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971).

Husband's Rewards. Husbands in dual-career families report enhanced intellectual companionship and satisfaction from being in a partnership that supports both careers and family (Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Rice, 1979). Another common reward mentioned by husbands is a "synergistic advantage" (Martin, Berry and Jacobsen, 1975) where being married to another professional facilitates both partners' career development and achievements.

Childless Dual-Career Marriages

Characteristics. Dual-career couples are the most likely (of all work-family patterns) to opt for "voluntary childlessness, or the deliberate, life-time decision of husbands and wives to forego parenting (procreation/adoption)" (Macklin, 1980; Veevers, 1979; Reiss, 1980). Empirical data supports this view with evidence showing the significant

correlation between highly educated females, and their career goals and fertility (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Mommsen, 1973; Veevers, 1979; Reiss, 1979). Many of the characteristics of voluntary childless couples are similar as those variables for the dual-career couples. Listed below are the common characteristics found in voluntary childless couples. They tend: to be college-educated or hold advanced degrees (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Mommsen, 1973; Magarick, 1975; Nason and Poloma, 1976); to have both husband and wife employed in relatively high-income positions (Rhee, 1973; Ritchey and Stokes, 1974); to be disproportionately first-born (Barnett and MacDonald, 1976; Thoen, 1977; Ory, 1978); to be more androgynous (Teicholz, 1977); to be less conventional (Magarick, 1975); to have delayed marriage (Ritchey and Stokes, 1974); to live in large urban areas (Rhee, 1973); and the wives have achieved more professional success and prestige (Veevers, 1974; Beckman, 1979; Reiss, 1980).

Incidence of Voluntary Childlessness. Although dual-career couples are the most likely of married couples to remain childless, the great majority of them do plan and raise children. The incidence of voluntary childlessness is quite small (5.6% of all marriages) and will remain under 10% for the decade of the 1980's (Reiss, 1980; Blake, 1979; Veevers, 1979). Because of the small percentage of couples who wish to remain childless, current research surveys are based on small

self-selected samples which are usually located through organizations such as the National Organization for Non-Parents (Barnett and MacDonald, 1976; Lichtman, 1976) or sterilization clinics (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Magarick, 1975; Kaltreider and Margoli, 1977). There are no national studies of childless marriages and therefore the conclusions of the research studies in this area rely on small samples and often neglect control groups (Macklin, 1980).

Consequences. The consequences of voluntary childlessness for the dual-career couple are not clear. Most research has shown that these child-free couples were neither more or less happy than those with children, although they reported their fears that a child would weaken their marital satisfaction (Nason and Poloma, 1976; Beckman, 1979; Veevers, 1979). The consequences for opting to remain child-free are greatest for the dual-career wife (Holmstrom, 1972; Nason and Poloma, 1976). Her career provides her with personal fulfillment, satisfaction and social adjustment but she often experiences the loneliness and rejection of society.

"There is no mystery regarding the greater centrality of childbirth to females in our society. This is due to the fact that the gender role of the female makes it clear, even in the 1980's, that there is a very high likelihood that the woman will have the major responsibility for any children that are born" (Reiss, 1980). Research has also indicated that

Americans tend to hold strong pronatalist attitudes (Blake, 1979) and that voluntary childless couples experience some degree of social disapproval (Nagarick, 1975; Houseknecht, 1977; Cooper et al., 1978; Ory, 1978).

Parental Roles in Dual-Career Families

Childhood Socialization

> By far the most complex demanding and all-involving role that members of our culture must ever learn to play is that of male or female. 'Casting' takes place immediately at birth, after a quick biological inspection, and the role of 'female' or 'male' is assigned. It is an assignment that will last one's entire lifetime and affect virtually everything one ever does. A large part of the next 20 years or so will be spent in gradually learning and perfecting one's assigned sex role; slowly memorizing what a 'young lady' should do and should not do, how a 'young man' should act (David and Brannon, 1976).

Parental Role Models. The world places important social distinctions on the basis of sex and parents act as role models for their children's sex role socialization. "Parents provide a conservative link with the past in that many of the behaviors are shadows of a distant socialization experience of their own" (Weitz, 1977). Because of their continued presence and great developmental importance to their children, parents play a pivotal role in the establishment of their children's sex role identity.

Definitions. It seems necessary at this point to present the following definitions. These terms will be used as defined throughout this paper.

Gender

The cultural expression of all that is feminine or masculine in a person (Bem, 1974). Although used interchangeably in the research literature, the term "gender" is often preferred over "sex". "Sex" generally designates the biological components of maleness and femaleness and has several different meanings in our society (Reiss, 1980; Kessler and McKenna, 1978).

Sex Role (or Gender Role)

A sum of expected behaviors attached to the differing social positions of male and female. These expected behaviors are related to both temperaments and tasks assigned to each sex (Scanzoni and Scanzoni, 1976).

Socialization

The process by which children and adults are prepared to occupy various roles. It is achieved through the provision and accumulation of life experiences that transmit knowledge, attitudes, and skills to perform functions

necessary for these roles. Socialization for young children is often deliberate and readily observable, as children are being prepared to carry out a complex collection of economic, social, physical, political, and psychological roles as adults. Much of adult socialization is subtle and unnoticed because it consists of continued reinforcement for already learned roles. In situations where the learning of new roles or skills is necessary, adult socialization may become extremely focused and explicit.

Sex Role Socialization

The differential processes and experiences used to prepare males and females for the roles that society defines as being appropriate for their sex.

Sex Role Stereotypes

Stereotypes based upon the assumption that because a number of individuals share one attribute (e.g. sex), they are similar in many others. Stereotypes arise from a natural need to organize the world around

us. They may also result in over-simplified beliefs, attitudes, or un-critical judgements. A sex role stereo-type may be defined as the assumption that all females or all males, because they share a common gender, also share common interests, abilities, values, and roles.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Definitions for socialization, sex role socialization, and sex role stereotyping are from 1975 federal regulations (45 CFR, part 160f) which pertain to the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Sex Role Theories. Few aspects of human development have so preoccupied researchers in the last decade as socialization --the process of instilling in children social values and gender roles. Any attempt to synthesize the data becomes a massive effort, not only because of the sheer volume of research, but also because of contemporary changes in perspective and gender role behavior. Three major theories of sex role development have surfaced and are supported by classical research studies. Each of these theories give central roles to parents as "transmitters of societally based sex roles" (Weitz, 1977).

Psychoanalytic Model. The psychoanalytic model was first introduced by Freud (1953) and later revised by Erikson (1963). The model is conceived with the overriding significance of biology and early experience in sex role development. It predicts the lifelong masculine and feminine qualities and generally ignores the influences of the cultural environment. The child is seen as the passive recipient of an inevitable program of complexes, which include envy of body parts and the desire to avoid punishment for bad feelings. Within this framework, gender roles are biologically determined and individuals are seen as having little control over life events.

Freud's psychoanalytic model has been widely criticized by feminists, psychotherapists, educators and the medical profession. Although he is greatly revered for his exploratory work in psychoanalysis, his theory of sex role development completely dismisses the cognitive and social realms of human beings. Feminists blame Freud for aiding male supremacy, promoting a negative image of women and furthering sexism (Women on Words and Images, 1975). "Acceptance of the Freudian view of sex roles requires belief in the primacy of the unconscious, the central role of sexuality and the enduring effect of childhood on adult personality" (Weitz, 1977).

Social Learning Theory. The second model, known as the social learning theory, emerged from the Skinnerian experimental tradition. Using the basic principles of learning

theory (e.g., modeling, shaping and reinforcement), the social learning position states that the acquisition of sex role behavior proceeds in the same way other behaviors are learned. Mischel, a social learning theorist believes the sex-typing process occurs in three stages. "First the child learns to discriminate between sex-typed behavior patterns, then to generalize from these specific learning experiences to new situations and finally to perform sex-typed behavior" (Mischel, 1970).

The social learning theory views a newborn infant as a relatively empty organism to be acted upon by the environment. The major focus of this theory is primarily on events in the environment that shape a child's sex role behavior (Mischel, 1970). Alternative sex roles are possible only if the external reinforcements for specific behaviors change. This theory has been challenged because: 1) most of the empirical work has been carried out within the confines of the experimental laboratory; 2) to date, no one has demonstrated the specific antecedents of sex role learning; 3) and the evidence of parental reinforcement of sex-appropriate and inappropriate behavior is weak. Also the validity of the social-learning theory "does not so much concern denial of its role in sex role acquisition, but rather its image of the functioning personality structure of the individual in interaction with the environment" (Weitz, 1977).

Cognitive Developmental Theory. Lawrence Kohlberg is the major proponent of the third model of sex role socialization. Kohlberg's cognitive developmental theory (1966) suggests a more active role for the child in contrast with the social learning explanation. He uses Piaget's cognitive stage framework (Piaget, 1970) to explain sex role learning as a function of a child's interaction with his or her environment. The level of cognitive growth sets up the kind and amount of information a child assimilates and accommodates. At a certain developmental stage the child cognitively recognizes his or her own sex and tries to imitate behaviors perceived to be appropriate to that specific sex.

> It is not the child's biological instincts, but rather his cognitive organization of social role concepts around universal physical dimensions which accounts for the existence of universals in sex-role attitudes. Our theory, then is cognitive in that it stresses the active nature of the child's thought as he organizes his role perceptions and role learnings around his basic conceptions of his body and his world...In contrast to the other views, we see the child's social and sexual attitudes neither as direct reflections of cultural patterns nor as direct reflections of innate structures... In summary, then, we have reported evidence of the development of basic universal conceptions of gender role in children between the ages of three and seven. First, there is the development of constant gender categories, second, the development of awareness of genital differences, and third, the development of diffuse masculine-feminine stereotypes based largely on the connotations of nongenital body imagery (Kohlberg, 1966).

Cognitive development theory, like the psycholoanalytic theory and social learning theories has been criticized because it halts at the status quo once sex-typing is explained. The underlying norm of these theories seems to be based on the assumption that the more sex typing there is, the better the adjustment of the individual in our society. The three major theories of sex role socialization emphasize different mechanisms: psycho-sexual bonds, modeling, and cognitive categorization. It is likely that all three of these mechanisms play decisive roles in the process of learning and accepting gender roles.

Psychological Androgyny Theory. Dr. Sandra Bem, a psychologist from Stanford University presents a new model of sex role development. Her theory of "psychological androgyny" offers a more flexible sex role (Bem, 1974). Psychological androgyny refers to individuals who are capable of behaving in integrative feminine and masculine ways i.e., assertive and yielding; independent and dependent; expressive and instrumental. Dr. Bem (1974) explains that it is not a union of masculine and feminine qualities, but moves beyond the masculine-feminine traits to a third integrated dimension that is influenced over a lifetime. Transcending sex roles is being androgynous. One of the problems with this unique model is that it assumes a separate content for masculinity and femininity.

Family's Role. These theories all place parents and family at the center of socializing young children's development of sex roles. "The family is the microcosm within which sex roles are most obviously salient; and it wields an influence on the development of sex role values that is uniquely powerful" (Van Fossen, 1977). The familial socialization experience provides a threshold for development of a child's sex role identity.

Dual-Career Parents. Dual-career families have been noted as offering a more flexible, androgynous gender role to their children (Lynn, 1979; Gold and Andres, 1977, 1978). In the past, parents who encouraged traditional femininity for their daughters, discouraged the development of intellectual attributes, achievement and independence. These parents employed differential treatment based on traditional sex roles to their daughters and sons.

Dual-career parents present a viable alternative to the traditional sex role. Career mothers act as models of intellectual style and achievement (Hoffman, 1974; Almquist, 1974; Lynn, 1979). Career fathers were found to model occupational skills and creativity, increasing their children's abilities to excel (Werts and Watley, 1972; Helson, 1968, 1971; Anastasi and Schaefer, 1969; Long et al., 1967). Research confirms that dual-career parents do serve as important models

for their children (most significantly for daughters), urging them toward achievement, intellectual pursuits, creativity and vocational choices (Lynn, 1979; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). Thus, Lynn (1979) asserts that dual-career parents tend to guide their children toward androgyny.

Division of Labor in the Home

Sex Stratification. "It is frequently assumed that as female labor force participation increases and as sex role attitudes become more liberal, sex-typed task allocation within the marriage and home will decrease. However the disturbing possibility remains that women's roles can change within one sphere of our society while not changing within another" (Beckman and Houser, 1979). As pointed out in the "problem" section of this paper, the trends toward greater opportunities and the phenomenal increase of women in the paid labor force, have not been matched by an increased involvement of men in the home. Women who work outside the home have added a secondary commitment to their primary commitment, their family.

A New Perspective. The division of labor by sex, "the specialization of everyday work roles according to sex" (Nielsen, 1978) has been recognized and explored in the research literature of the past decade. Recently, a new perspective has evolved on the division of labor within the family. The family is viewed as a unit with a set of task

requirements both inside and outside the home (Young and Wilmott, 1973; Pleck, 1977). This perspective is advantageous because it allows the researcher to "examine the family role sets that evolve for performance of the necessary tasks...and 'women's work'/'men's work' can be viewed as one set of task requirements for which a particular solution has evolved" (Ericksen et al., 1979).

Origin of Division of Labor. Social-scientists (Levi-Strauss, 1971; Leibowitz, 1978; Engles, 1971) and anthropologists trace the origin of the sexual division of labor to the fact that women in many primitive societies, having borne the children, stayed home in order to nurse and care for them. In hunting and gathering societies, women--the nurses and caretakers of infants grew progressively more dependent generation by generation, performing the less mobile occupations. But women's roles in childbearing, childrearing and sedentary tasks near the home, and the degree of their importance as food gatherers, meant they became the "second sex". Power differentials developed as men came to possess weapons and other means of physical power.

Others argue that the division of labor became institutionalized with the rise of the state and class society (Gough, 1971; Firestone, 1970). What was originally a convenient and functional pattern became institutionalized even though the sexual division of labor became less critical for

social survival. Sociologist Juliet Mitchell (1973) asserts that the origin of the oppression of women lies in the demand for private property and the development of a patriarchal system in which a man had to have exclusive sexual rights to his wife to insure the legitimacy of his offspring. Mitchell does not hold a simplistic economic view of women's oppression, but finds women's status determined in four key structures of society: production, reproduction, sexuality, and socialization of children.

Myth of Greater Equalization. Today the dual-career family research reports an increased integration of work and family roles for both sexes (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971, 1980; Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971), but questions the extent as well as the determinants of changes in the division of labor in the family. "It has been theorized that dual-career family roles are a reversal of the traditional family roles in that the male becomes more involved in the domestic activities of the home as the female becomes more career-oriented. Egalitarian division of labor has been often discussed as a 'truth' or basic premise of the dual-career lifestyle" (Hopkins and White, 1978). This myth resulted from the early studies of dual-worker families indicating a greater equalization of the amount of domestic work done in the household (Blood, 1963; Blood and Hamblin, 1958; Blood and Wolfe, 1960).

Women's Work. However, more recent studies with dual-career families have shown that although attitudes may be more egalitarian, the actual division of labor in the family remains traditional, relegating most of the tasks to the female (Epstein, 1971; Newland, 1980; Bird, 1979; Sawin and Parke, 1979; Lein, 1979; Bernard, 1971; Bryson et al., 1976; Oakley, 1974; Whitehurst, 1977; Berk and Berk, 1979; La Rossa and La Rossa, 1981; Vanek, 1974; Albrecht et al., 1979; Johnson and Johnson, 1977; General Mills, Inc., 1981; Walker and Woods, 1976). Thus, it is the wives in dual-career couples who truly combine work and family. Bryson et al. (1976) concluded "that sharing a profession did not mean sharing the housework."

Men's Work. There is some empirical evidence to indicate that dual-career fathers tend to "help out" more with child-care than the household tasks (Bird, 1979; Sawin and Parke, 1979; Booth and Edwards, 1980; Eversoll, 1979; Hill and Stafford, 1980; Albrecht et al., 1979; Farkas, 1978). But even in their "help" with child-care, there remains a division of labor within the caregiving tasks. "Fathers do what they like with children, mothers do what has to be done with them" (Bird, 1979). Women usually spend their time on "custodial" tasks such as washing and feeding, while men's time with their children more often involves play (Robinson, 1977). Future research in this area would help us understand the implications of the parental division of labor with children.

Women's Two Shifts.

> In no area is the division of labor more deeply ingrained than in the area of child-care. The firm identification of infant and child-care as women's work is no doubt based on the biological role of the nursing mother--but it extends far beyond the breast-feeding stage. The responsibility is not a light one...Carrying the major responsibility for child-care and other unpaid labor, handicaps women in the formal labor market. The second shift at home competes with the demands of the workplace for women's time, energy, and attention...As long as private lives and public institutions are arranged around the assumption that the home is a female province, women's opportunities for achievement in other domains will be limited (Newland, 1980).

Psycho-sociological Factors. It has been argued that men do not increase their family participation (even in dual-career families) because of several psycho-sociological factors. The strongest argument lies in childhood socialization and the way males are brought up to view their family role. "Occupation and not marriage and the family, is the male's key life role in our society" (Reiss, 1980) and most men perceive their breadwinning role as their primary contribution to the family (Lein, 1979; Fogarty et al., 1971; Tognoli, 1979). Another important factor is the existence of social pressures and expectations which coerce both mothers and fathers to fulfill sex-appropriate roles (Lein, 1979; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Reiss, 1980). Thirdly, Defrain (1979) found that inflexible work schedules hampered parents (especially fathers) sharing

child-care. Also, a number of researchers point out that dual-career couples accept a secondary status for the wife's career and view the family as the wife's primary responsibility (Holmstrom, 1972; Poloma, 1972; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Fogarty et al., 1971; Poloma and Garland, 1971). Finally, social support networks are deficient for dual-career families, i.e., day-care, counseling services, parent education (Lein, 1979; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Hill and Stafford, 1980).

Overcommitted Wives. "Dual-career wives may be in terms of combined hours of household and employment tasks, the most overcommitted and disadvantaged and are, according to some radical feminists the most enslaved" (Beckman and Houser, 1979). Survey after survey report that employed women spend less time on the average at household labors than non-employed women, out the total hours they spend working at home and in the workplace surpasses the total of either men or non-employed women--often by as much as 10 to 15 hours a week (Szalai, 1975; Newland, 1980; Albrecht et al., 1979; Vanek, 1973; Ericksen et al., 1979; Davidson and Gordon, 1979).

Domestic Services. Thus, it is easy to understand why professional couples must rely on housekeeping and child-care services to reduce their workload. However, there is a dwindling supply of good help and employees of these necessary services tend to drift in and out of domestic occupations. To date, delegation of household and child-care services is not

yet a practical alternative for dual-career couples (Newland, 1980; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Beckman and Houser, 1979).

Employed Mothers

Myth of Motherhood. "American society is unusual in the value it puts on the mother remaining home with the children all or most of the time" (Whiting, 1972). Throughout the world mothers are expected to make financial contributions to their families and country's economic stability. In America, motherhood has been fictionalized and idealized as the most sacrosanct and saintliest of roles for women. "The mystique of the glories of childbirth, the grandeur of 'natural' female creativity, and the glories and creativity of childrearing" have contributed to the "myth of motherhood" (Whitehurst, 1977). Simone de Beauvoir (1970) discusses this myth as the "Cult of Maternity".

This author does hold a special reverance for mothers (as well as fathers) but finds contradictory themes in the research literature, popular literature and in society's views of motherhood. Although motherhood is boasted about as the "noblest and most significant" role (Freud, 1953), it remains even today, the root of our psychoanalytic problems (Beels, 1978). Motherhood is associated with power (Hare-Mustin and Broderick, 1979) but an overwhelming percentage of mothers actually have very little power in their own families (see "power" section). The creation of new life and childrearing

are celebrated in our culture only through lip-service, while in reality the U.S. gross national product (GNP) denies the value of mothers' work by giving it a non-productive status (Newland, 1980). Furthermore, American society and government pauses for a national Mother's Day holiday but ignores mothers' requests the rest of the year for supportive structures i.e., daycare, social security benefits for non-working mothers, counseling services, employment considerations.

Motherhood and Employment. There remains a strong relationship between motherhood and waged labor in our society today. "When women go into waged labor, they do so as mothers...1) Most importantly, women enter the labor market in order to fulfill their duty as mothers in the home (e.g., to secure money to buy goods and services for their families). 2) Once in the labor market, women, all women, are treated as mothers--former, actual, or potential. 3) As paid market workers, women continue to do 'mothering' on the job" (Sokoloff, 1981). Employed women are viewed as "working mothers" rather than as "employees".

As more mothers have gone to work, there has been a rising clamor of concern from researchers, educators, medical doctors, clergy and traditionalists that the employed mothers' children will be harmed. No where do we find concern over children with employed fathers, nor does the research or popular literature address the effects of paternal employment on their children.

Mothers must entirely shoulder the blame and guilt from critics whether they remain in the home or find outside employment. If they stay home, they are criticized for their mundane, unstimulating lifestyle and smothering/over-concern with their children; and if they are employed, they are accused of neglecting the children they used to smother (Beels, 1978). It is no wonder that mothers seem defensive when questioned about their home vs. work situation.

Effects of Maternal Employment. Since the early 1950's, childrearing specialists and social-scientists have been preoccupied with the effects of maternal employment upon children. Reviewing the research and popular literature of the 1950's and 60's, reveals negative consequences for children (especially those under 5 years old) of working mothers (Nye and Hoffman, 1963; Siegel and Haas, 1963; Stolz, 1960; Hand, 1957; Hoffman, 1963; Rouman, 1956; Yarrow, 1961; Moore, 1963, 1964). Nearly all of the child-care books of that era expressed disapproval of nonmaternal care and of maternal employment in the early years (Bahr, 1968; Brazelton, 1969; Glover, 1963; Goodrich, 1968; Kugelmass, 1965; Miller, 1968; Piers, 1966; Ribble, 1965; Spock, 1946, 1967; U.S. Children's Bureau, 1963). Two of these sources, Spock (1946, 1967) and U.S. Children's Bureau (1963) sold millions of copies over the years, warning employed mothers of raising neglected and maladjusted children. Group child-care (e.g., day-care) was

pronounced undesirable for young children. Kugelmass (1965) asserted that "the worst natural mother is better in the long run than the best day-care."

These early studies and child-care books have received much criticism for their methodological problems and lack of controls i.e., difference in family backgrounds, caretaker/ child ratios, quality of day-care, child's age of entry and mother's attitude toward employment. Self-selected samples of problem children were used, presenting a bleak picture of children from employed mothers. "The unfortunate consequences of maternal employment were illustrated with hypothetical examples of young children who suffered from the neglect and the guilt-induced behaviors of their working parents" (Etaugh, 1980).

More recently, the research literature has re-examined the relationship between maternal employment and the development of young children. During the last decade, the body of literature has continued to expand, relating new variables to improve upon the previous studies in the area. Overall, findings show very little evidence that maternal employment is harmful to a child's behavior or development (Moore, 1978; Etaugh, 1974; Anderson, 1980; Hoffman, 1974; Hoffman, 1979; Gold and Andres, 1977).

Conclusion. After an extensive review of the literature on the effects of maternal employment on young children, the author has drawn the following conclusions:

1) There is little evidence that the mother's working is harmful to young or school-age children (Moore, 1978; Gold and Andres, 1977; Schwartz, 1980).

2) There are few differences in the children of working mothers on such factors as anxiety, dependency, aggressiveness, and eating and toileting problems (Etaugh, 1974, 1978).

3) The mother's satisfaction with her employment status is significant for her child's adjustment (Moore, 1978; Anderson, 1980; Gold and Andres, 1977, 1978).

4) Parental warmth and acceptance is more significant than daily caretaking in facilitating children's independence, adjustment and harmonious parent-child relations (Martin, 1975).

5) Children of employed mothers have broader, less sex-typed concepts of males and females (Gold and Andres, 1977, 1978; Moore, 1978).

6) Children of employed mothers (particularly girls), have higher occupational aspirations than the children of non-employed mothers (Moore, 1978; Lynn, 1974; Van Fossen, 1977; Miller, 1975).

7) Infants and toddlers can form secure attachments to day-care caregivers and day-care for very young children need not be harmful so long as programs are high quality and the ratio of children to adults is low (3 or 4 to one adult) (Hazen, 1978; Ricciuti, 1974; Caldwell et al., 1970).

8) In general, the school achievements of children of employed mothers does not differ from that of children with non-employed mothers, although there is some doubt about this generalization with regard to lower and middle class boys (Brown, 1970; Hoffman, 1979; Moore, 1978).

The Renaissance of Fathering

Secondary Status. Just as we find the "myth of motherhood" prevailing in American society, fatherhood has been given a secondary status in the home and family. The popular and research literature have labeled the father as "invisible," "aloof," "ambivalent," "distant," "inadequate," "incompetent,"

and "indifferent" in his parental role (Booth and Edwards, 1980; Eversoll, 1979; Brenton, 1966; Fromm, 1968; Sexton, 1969; Fein, 1978). Margaret Mead once claimed that "fathers are a biological necessity but a social accident" (McLain and Crawford, 1978). In the past three decades, research in parenting and child development focused on mothers, completely ignoring the significance of fathers with their children.

The Traditional Perspective. The traditional perspective of father was one who cared for his children, primarily by succeeding in the occupational area (Bowlby, 1951). From this view, men were symbolically important to their children as role models of power and authority, but had little direct interaction with the children.

> Traditionally, Father has been looked on as the breadwinner. In times past, so much of his time and energy was used in this role that at home he was thought of as taciturn and stern, albeit kind. He was respected but feared by his children who never learned to know him very well. He accepted the fact that he earned the money and Mother cared for the home and raised the children (English, 1954).

Although their careers and social prestige have flourished, fathers have paid a high price for their out-of-the-home success. According to statistics, men have higher criminal records, more stress-related illnesses due to strenuous work, higher suicide rates, more heart attacks, and as a rule die at an earlier age than women (Palme, 1970; Pleck and Sawyer, 1974). American fathers have been greatly

disadvantaged in following their prescribed sex role. In addition to the above statistics, fathers have been alienated from their homes and families. They have been denied parental status in the hospital delivery rooms, school programs, custody battles and with the workplace.

Changing Images. Spurred by the women's movement, high divorce rates, unemployment, father-coached childbirth, and changing sex roles, the image of fatherhood is changing. "Growing legions of men are rejecting the notion that father is the peripheral parent. And as they face up to both the pleasures and pains of childrearing, they are discovering that dad can be just as caring as mom--and might even enjoy it" (Langway et al., 1981). "Fatherhood is the new family romance of the 80's...the unexplored frontier," says New York psychiatrist Avodah K. Offit (1981). Many fathers, like mothers want to expand their traditional role, developing their full potentials as total human beings. This new image has little to do with the macho, aggressive, materially successful dimensions of traditional family roles, but instead "requires the American male to be more fully human and responsive than he has historically been encouraged to be" (Eversoll, 1979).

Beginning in the last decade, social-scientists began studying men's roles in the family, quality and time of father-child interaction, father absence, paternal influence and transition to parenthood (Price-Bonham, 1976; Aldous, 1975;

Lamb, 1976; Lewis and Pleck, 1979; Bradley, R., 1980; Lynn, 1974, 1976; Biller, 1974; Booth and Edwards, 1980; Mackey and Day, 1979; Sawin and Parke, 1979; Tognoli, 1979; Levine, 1977; Pederson, 1980; Pleck and Sawyer, 1974; La Rossa and La Rossa, 1981). It appears that the role of father is becoming increasingly valued. Research in this area began by concentrating on father-absent families and has grown to emphasizing the broad range of activities in which fathers participate.

The Benefits of Father. Research findings indicate that a father's contribution to his children's development is quite significant and equally important as the mother's influence. Even as the fetus grows, expectant fathers often experience the "Couvade Syndrome", suffering with their wife through pains, nausea and weight gain (Langway, 1981). When involved with the birthing process, fathers interact with their newborn, establishing lifelong bonds, referred to as "engrossment" (Greenburg and Morris, 1974). This enduring emotional link with the child was once thought to be exclusively maternal. Other studies report fathers to be as nurturant, affectionate, and as active with their infants as mothers (Parke and O'Leary, 1976; Sawin and Parke, 1979; Lamb, 1980; Kotelchuck, 1976; Radin, 1976; Lynn and Cross, 1974; Clark-Stewart, 1977). Fathers and mothers do seem to organize their time with young children differently. Mothers tend to provide the custo al

care and verbal interaction with their children (Parke, 1979; Bird, 1979; Robinson, 1977) while fathers spend a great proportion of their time in play activities i.e., physical and tactile stimulation (Lamb, 1977; Kotelcheck, 1976; Clark-Stewart, 1977). Lamb et al. (1979) argue that fathers play an "enormously important" role in the socialization of both their sons and daughters. They provide a "same-gender" model for their son's sex role development and influence their daughter's achievement motivation and career aspirations.

Emancipation of Man. As research has indicated, fathers are a valuable asset to their children's lives and society is finally recognizing that "parenting" means important roles for both mothers and fathers. Not all males are ready for "passionate paternal involvement" (Langway et al., 1981) but attitudes seem to be changing toward a somewhat more egalitarian view of childrearing (General Mills, 1981). S. Adams Sullivan (1980) states, "this is not just a passing trend...fathers are being forced into closer relationships with their children and then falling in love." Thus, the problem of changing sex roles is not simply a "woman's problem" but "the sex role problem" for both sexes. "We therefore look upon the emancipation of the man as important for the development of our children and for equality between the sexes. Both men and women need to work toward this end" (Palme, 1970).

Strains on Dual-Career Families

An overwhelming amount of the literature on dual-career families addresses the stresses and strains of the dual-career lifestyle. It is not difficult to imagine why the dual-career family is considered "the family form most problematic, from both standpoints of the career market and the family style itself" (Hunt and Hunt, 1977). Studies reveal the by-product of this career-family relationship is most often "strain" (Hunt and Hunt, 1977; Darley, 1976; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971, 1978; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Hall and Hall, 1979; Rice, 1979; Holahan and Gilbert, 1979; Lewis and Pleck, 1979; Coser and Rokoff, 1974; Lieber, 1980).

"Superwoman". The ability to cope with the roles of parent, spouse, and career lies mostly in the wife's individual adaptation to the tension of "two activity systems" (Coser and Rokoff, 1974; Bell, 1979). Consequently, it is the dual-career wife who is under the most strain in the family system. The "myth of motherhood", inequality of division of labor in the home, conflict of values, and the lack of clear normative guidelines for such a combination of roles, all add to the "double-bind" phenomenon (Janeway, 1971; Schwartz, 1980). Women also have been socialized to develop traditional feminine qualities (e.g., nurturance, emotionality, responsiveness to people rather than ideas) which are directly incompatible with

the qualities necessary to function in the workplace (e.g., aggressiveness, rationality, and independence) (Maccoby, 1963; Horner, 1972). Coping with the pressures of the double-bind phenomenon and the legacy of feminized socialization, dual-career women often find their "superwoman" roles impossible (Langway et al., 1980).

Theories of Role Strain. In their attempts to combine career and family, dual-career women are experiencing what Goode (1960) coined as "role strain". Goode defined this variable as the "felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations" (1960). "It is the stress generated within a person when he/she either cannot comply or has difficulty complying with the expectations of a role or set of roles" (Burr et al., 1979). Merton (1957) first examined the problem of "role-sets" and emphasized the systemic connection among the roles. Believing that role strain was a normal, everyday problem in industrial society, Merton delineated the "social mechanisms" operating to counteract the "instability of role-sets" (1957). Goode's (1960) work on role strain focuses on role overload while Merton's (1957) theory focuses on role conflict as a source of role strain. The theory of "Multiple Role Overload" (Goode, 1960) perceives "the individual's total role obligations as over-demanding...and he/she has limited resources i.e., energy and time, to be allocated among alternative ends." Despite their minor differences, both

Merton and Goode present essentially the same argument, that role accumulation will almost always lead to role strain.

Sieber (1974) challenges the idea that role accumulation inevitably leads to role strain and points out four major reasons why multiple roles might result in a net gain for the individual. These reasons are the following: 1) role privileges; 2) resources for status enhancement and role performance; 3) overall status security; and 4) enrichment of the personality and ego gratification. Marks (1977, 1979) also argues against the assumption that role strain is a given when individuals carry multiple roles. "As Marks sees it, the decisive factor in whether or not an individual will experience role overload is not the amount of energy which a person has to accomplish a task or even the amount of time available, but the level of commitment to the task" (La Rossa, 1981). Thus, the more committed one is to a task, the less likely the performance of that task will result in role strain.

La Rossa (1981) in his "Integrated Theory of Role Strain" views the theories of Merton (1957), Goode (1960), Sieber (1974), and Marks (1977, 1979) as offering different slants on the same problem and further, "complements of each other". He suggests that "aligning actions" (Stokes and Hewitt, 1976) may provide "a linchpin in an integrated theory of role strain" (La Rossa, 1981). Aligning actions have been defined as "verbal activities and include motives, remedial interchanges and

accounts...In other words, they are a form of situational ethics which allows people to hold on to their absolute standards...They are essentially collective or individual rationalizations which permit people to cope with the problematic" (La Rossa and La Rossa, 1981). La Rossa's (1981) integrated theory encourages the "incorporation of concepts such as role-playing, role-taking, and role-making into theories of role strain," an idea first suggested twenty years ago (Turner, 1962).

Implications. These five theories of role strain have implications for understanding dual-career families trying to cope with multiple roles. From Merton's (1957) view, the parental position itself "consists of an array of diverse relationships which are often in conflict with each other and it is difficult to think of many positions in our society with more problematic role sets...as parenthood" (LeMasters, 1970). Adding career responsibilities to parenthood creates a demand and supply problem causing negotation and bargaining (Goode, 1960). Sieber (1974) notes that "...despite the likelihood of role conflict for the working mother, women are seeking a wider role repertoire to increase their resources, privileges, and sense of personal worth." Marks (1977) concludes that it is necessary to balance commitments in work and family life. "The more narrow the range of overcommitted interests, the more occasion there will be to feel drained and overloaded" (Marks,

1979). La Rossa (1981) focuses on aligning actions in helping us to understand "the discrepancy between actual or intended acts and beliefs about what is normal or probable."

Coping Strategies for Dual-Career Families

Strategies

The research literature points out that stress is inherent in a dual-career lifestyle, but not necessarily problematic for all dual-career families. In order to successfully adapt to the stress of the work-family system, dual-career couples must generally employ individual coping strategies because to date, institutionalized supports do not exist (Holmstrom, 1972; Skinner, 1980). Based on the theoretical framework of Hill (1949) and Burr (1973), the family system is viewed as a reactor to stress and as a manager of resources within the family system. In recent years, researchers and family professionals have come to believe "that understanding how families cope with stress is just as important as understanding the frequency and severity of life changes and transition themselves" (McCubbin et al., 1980).

Coping Behavior Within the Family. Empirical evidence links "coping" with successful individual adjustment to stress and dual-career research probes the stress-mitigating strategies which these individual families employ. "These coping behaviors are aimed at maintaining or strengthening the family system and at securing support from sources external to

the family" (Skinner, 1980). Dual-career couples have a variety of techniques they use to maintain their multiple roles as professionals, parents and marital partners. As Sieber (1974) points out, many dual-career couples believe their attitudes or "mind-sets" propel them in reducing cognitive dissonance. They realize that stress is an inevitable part of their family-work pattern, but prefer the advantages of the dual-career lifestyle to other alternative forms (Poloma, 1972; Lieber, 1980; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). Defining their situation as "stress optimization" (Bebbington, 1973), helps dual-career couples to live with their hectic lifestyles from a positive perspective.

Another most important strategy employed by dual-career couples is organization of time, energy, schedules, and priorities (Rice, 1979; St. John-Parsons, 1978; Poloma, 1972; Holmstrom, 1972; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). "Any difficulty or reluctance on the part of dual-career couples to carefully plan and organize their lives is likely to lead to marital conflict" (St. John-Parsons, 1978). Establishing priorties for themselves in terms of time and tasks; reordering priorities when necessary; developing highly structured, but flexible schedules; managing and controlling the organization of their lives, offers dual-career couples opportunities to maximize their potentials. Compromise is another common coping technique noted in the dual-career literature as a method of

reducing stress. Generally women seem to compromise the most, especially in their career goals if there are competing role demands (Bernard, 1974; Epstein, 1971; Rice, 1979; Heckman et al., 1977; Holmstrom, 1972). However, dual-career husbands often make career sacrifices too (e.g., compromising advancement opportunities to reduce role conflict, turning down company transfers to maintain both careers) (Maynard and Zawacki, 1979; Holmstrom, 1972; Epstein, 1971).

In order to manage domestic overload, most dual-career families deliberately lower their standards and simplify the physical chores (McCubbin, 1979; Lieber, 1980). Household chores are often delegated to family members or hired domestic services. Adapting to career mobility and relocation, dual-career couples often opt for the following solutions: 1) compromising career goals and priorities; 2) negotiating for two positions--"spouse bargaining"; 3) integrating careers in related fields; 4) commuting daily or on weekends in order to develop both careers; and 5) becoming a "company couple" (Maynard and Zawacki, 1979). Another interesting finding indicates that many dual-career couples stay physically active (e.g., physical activities, sports, entertainment, hobbies) and in good health which is a valuable asset in facing the stresses and strains of everyday living (Pines and Kafry, 1981).

Finally, a "helping component" (Burke and Weir, 1976) in the marital relationship can serve as a stress-mitigating

function within the dual-career family. "Qualities such as open communication, empathy, emotional reassurance, support, and sensitivity to the others feelings, characterize this theraputic role" (Burke and Weir, 1976). These qualities, as in any form of marriage, would serve to strengthen the relationship. "The strongest resource a dual-career family possesses lies in the marriage relationship itself" (Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980). Employing sensitivity and respect to each partner's "tension lines" enabled some dual-career families to cope successfully and positively with their work and family commitments. The Rapoports (1978) define these "tension lines" as "establishing points beyond which individuals feel they cannot be pushed except at risks to themselves or the relationship."

Role Sharing. Although dual-career couples tend to remain traditional in their division of family roles, the concept of "role sharing" (Bernard, 1973) has been strongly suggested by feminists and social-scientists as a necessary step for the survival of the dual-career family. Role sharing involves the "mutual sharing of rights and responsibilities by husband and wife" (Haas, 1977) and has also been labeled "the egalitarin family" (Garland, 1972), "the symmetrical family" (Young and Willmont, 1973), "role-de-differentiation" (Mowrer, 1969) and "jointness of conjugal roles" (Bott, 1971). Researchers and

feminists maintain that expanding the roles for both mothers i.e., career in addition to motherhood, and fathers i.e., domestic and child-care responsibilities in addition to career, provide the family system with a more satisfying and equitable lifestyle (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971, 1978; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Hall and Hall, 1979; Newland, 1980). It is this author's opinion that role-sharing is one of the key strategies that dual-career couples must learn to employ in order for the family system to fuction smoothly with the workplace.

Employment Considerations

Job-Revolution. The impact of employment upon the family is noted throughout the research literature, but only recently have researchers studied the influence of the dual-career and dual-worker family upon the marketplace. In the past, corporate capitalism treated the worker "as if" she or he had no family (Kanter, 1977). The "myth of separate worlds" (Piotrikowski, 1979) denied both families and the employers, the opportunity to face the dilemmas created by the work-family interface. John Naisbitt, senior vice president of Yankelovich, Skelly and White anticipates the "beginnings of a job revolution in America, a basic restructuring of the work environment from top-down to bottom-up...The American worker is about to be saved by one of the most unlikely forces in society--call it humanization, personal growth, the 'human

potential movement', participatory management...Call it whatever, it is about to converge with the economic necessity of the seventies and eighties to rescue the American worker from a deadpan existence" (Autry, 1980).

Employee Benefits. Career and working couples refuse to prescribe a single solution for employers to help support the family-work system. Viewpoints are diverse, varying with individual family needs, children's ages, financial circumstances and domestic organization. Researchers have found the following employment benefits would greatly enhance the families ability to cope with both work and family systems (General Mills, 1981; Defrain, 1979; Catalyst, 1981; Langway et al., 1980; Pleck, 1977; Holmstrom, 1972; Hall and Hall, 1979; Newland, 1980; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Cook, 1978; Davidson and Gordon, 1979; Autry, 1980; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971).

1) More Part-Time Work. The benefit receiving the most overwhelming support is more part-time work with better pay and fringe benefits for both mothers and fathers. Unfortunately, most women currently take the bulk of part-time employment, delegating them to low status positions, low pay and dead-end jobs. If employers provided men and women with career positions, but part-time hours and

half the position's wages, and benefits, both parents could work half-time and survive financially.

2) Job-Sharing Opportunities. Related to the need for part-time work is the de. and for more job-sharing opportunities. Thus, two people would share the work, salary, and fringe benefits of one full-time position. Corporations which have tried job-sharing find it most productive and highly efficient (Levine, 1977; Defrain, 1979).

3) Flexible Work Schedules. Another popular benefit which dual-career couples endorse is more flexible work schedules. One of the most widespread programs, called flex-time has received wide-spread support from employers, employees and communities. In the flex-time system, "the required time on the job flexes to accommodate individualized work schedules" (Autry, 1980). In Europe, between 30%-50% of the entire workforce utilizes the flex-time program but in the U.S. estimates are between 2%-6% (Defrain, 1979; Langway et. al., 1980).

4) Child-Care. The issue of child-care for employee dependents is the most widely discussed of all programs, but remains the most controversial. Most corporations which have tried this approach have found it to be cost-effective, tax deductible, and positively related to work attendance and employee attitudes. This issue will be discussed in a later section of the paper.

5) Family Counseling. Dual-career families and employers have found family counseling programs on alcohol, stress, marital, sexual and parental problems to be positively related to production, cost-effectiveness and better family-work relationships. One company, Northern States Power in Minnesota supports an employee assistance program and channels information from employees to management in order to establish policies which reflect workers' concerns and needs (Autry, 1980).

6) Relocation Assistance. A few companies are beginning to acknowledge the dual-career pattern and are providing

relocation assistance to families. Counseling for relocating spouses and information on schools, transportation, and housing aid families with the transition to a new city.

7) Family Leaves. Maternity, paternity, disability, personal and family leaves are still experimental in the workplace, but are strongly suggested by career couples trying to cope with family and work. Sweden provides the U.S. with a model plan for developing family leaves.

Revitalization. Corporations and employers do seem to be aware of the needs of dual-career families, but are progressing slowly during this time of economic recession. New provisions for tax breaks may spur some companies forward with much needed supports for families. But private industry should not wait for government-induced incentives to aid American workers. "They should act with their own enlightened self-interest at heart, to establish the kinds of human, accommodating work environments which promote satisfaction, fulfillment, peace of mind and high productivity" (Autry, 1980). Hopefully, employers will listen to their workers, and labor and management can become partners in revitalizing the American spirit of work and family.

Day-Care

> No one toils harder at living two lives than the 5.5 million working mothers of pre-school children, the fastest growing segment of the work force...These mothers have 7 million small children to worry about and there are precious few places to put them. Counting public, private and commercial facilities, the United States now has fewer licensed day-care slots available than in 1945: 1.6 million openings. That leaves another 5.4 million kids to be parcelled out among babysitters and nursery schools--or left alone (Langway et al., 1980).

Critical Shortage. The national need for day-care, whether it be with relatives, babysitters, public or commerical centers, is critical. Custodial care, not to mention quality early childhood programs remain in short supply, "forcing women to make agonizing choices" (Friedan, 1980). Over twenty-five percent of working parents leave their children with relatives during the day, but for most dual-career couples this is not an acceptable or a practical solution (Hall and Hall, 1979). Although day-care in an institutional setting makes up only about 10 percent of the child-care alternatives utilized by employed parents, research indicates that only one in five families who seek day-care centers find openings (General Mills, 1981; Langway et al., 1980; Hall and Hall, 1979). An estimated two-million "latch-key" children care for themselves before and after school and even when they're ill (Hall and Hall, 1979; Langway et al., 1980).

Researchers find dual-career couples clamoring for quality day-care programs and often willing to spend a high proportion of their income on their child-care priority. The cost of quality, private child-care is expensive and almost prohibitive. Many dual-career families report difficulties in securing reliable, competent caregivers who are available for longer, somewhat flexible hours (Roland and Harris, 1979). Some families have shifts of employees, others hire illegal aliens, and a few parents take their children to the office. As pointed out previously, it is usually the mother who sacrifices her career and copes with the child-care problem.

Low Priority. Stephen Hess, National Chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth reported that, "the actual patterns of life in America today are such that children and families come last" (1970). The United States is one of the only industrialized nations in the world without a national child-care program. Cross-cultural research reveals the strong commitment to day-care of countries such as: the Soviet Union, Sweden, Norway, England, France, Israel, and Germany (Cook, 1978; Reiss, 1980; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Weathers, 1979). Japan remains as cautious as the United States, relegating child-care to unregistered, unsupervised, overcrowded centers (Cook, 1978).

Politics. Surveys substantiate that overall, most employed mothers want federally subsidized, not federally controlled day-care (Langway et al., 1979). Congress has debated the subject in every session since 1970, but conservative activists have helped to defeat comprehensive day-care legislation. In 1971, Congress approved a $15 billion child-development program aimed at providing quality child-care for all, but it was later vetoed by President Nixon. He declared that such government interference would threaten family life. Phyllis Schlafly, a conservative lobbyist believes as past President Nixon and current President Reagan that "there's no substitute for the care of the real mother" (Langway et al., 1979). With the current economic recession, budget cuts, and conservative political climate, a national program for day-care may be ten to fifteen years away.

Corporate Day-Care. The current administration has somewhat encouraged private industry into the field of child-care with tax incentives. Most companies complain that on-site centers are too expensive and troublesome to operate. Corporations such as, Stride-Rite, Levi-Strauss, Polaroid, and Control Data of Minneapolis have adopted child-care plans because they make economic sense. They cut absenteeism and tardiness, satisfy unions, and retain experienced women. Although each corporation has developed its own approach in providing day-care benefits, overall companies have found them to be an effective solution for working parents.

Women's Issue. Day-care is still considered a women's issue in the United States but dual-career and dual-worker families are making unions and employers increasingly aware that day-care is a "workers' issue". "We made the revolutionary discovery in the late 70's that kids have two parents...but people can't share parenting because the system won't let them" (Steinem, 1980). Feminists have vowed to make day-care and other family issues top political priorities in the 1980's. Betty Friedan argues that "the agenda for the 80's must be the restructuring of the institutions of home and work" (1980). By the 1990's employed mothers with young children will be nearly 14 million strong and "there is going to be a crisis if nothing is done about day-care in this decade" (Norton, 1980).

Social Supports

Definition. The concept of social support has been defined in the research literature in a myriad of ways. The most widely accepted definition has been advanced by Cobb (1976). He views social support "as information exchanged at the interpersonal level which provides: 1) emotional support, leading the individual to believe that he/she is cared for and loved; 2) esteem support, leading the individual to believe he/she is esteemed and valued; and 3) network support, leading an individual to believe he/she belongs to a network of communication involving mutual obligation and mutual

understanding." Some writers have referred to social support as information given to aid people in problem solving and new social contacts for help (Granovetter, 1973), while others view it as material aid/tangible services offered by churches and the Red Cross (McCubbin et al., 1980).

Social Networks. Researchers note special problems with relationships of dual-career families with social networks (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971, 1978; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Hall and Hall, 1979). Because these families lack clear social precident, they must pioneer their way within the social environment. "If the dual-career family is to be more than an ephemeral phenomenon, the couple must work out ways of sustaining it--supports and bulwarks of various kinds" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). Researchers have found that the normative social supports (e.g., kin networks, neighbors, husband's friends) which have a positive effect on reducing stress for most families are not viable alternatives for dual-career families.

Dilemmas. Conventional social supports are deficient for many dual-career families which adds another strain to an already overloaded lifestyle. Family kin networks usually provide the most significant support for traditional families, but for dual-career couples kin relationships tend to diminsh. "This is partly due to their geographic and social mobility and sheer paucity of kin because so many of them are 'only' children" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). It is usually the

husband's friends and the neighbors who serve as a friendship pool for traditional families, but dual-career couples tend to establish their relationships on a couple basis rather than an individual one. Dual-career wives also bring friendships from their workplaces into the couple's social system. Research points out that dual-career couples, especially wives, are not understood or socially supported in their neighborhoods or among the husband's social circle (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Berger et al., 1978; Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980; Darley, 1976). Many dual-career wives experience loneliness, peer pressure and estrangement.

Resolutions. Dual-career couples have dealt with disapproval in their social environments in various ways (e.g., encapsulating the work and family relationships, joking about the disapproval, and withdrawing from social involvements outside work except on a very selective basis). However, in order for dual-career families to become a more viable alternative, tolerance and social supports must be encouraged to develop.

> What seems to emerge from our own studies and observations is the importance of distinguishing between form and process. If there is a stereotyped reaction against a given social form because it is different, society will not be able to distinguish between new forms that are valuable and those that are not. Quantity and quality must not be confused. If only a small number of people practice a particular pattern, it is not necessarily

> unimportant...The essential point is the processual one: How is it diverging? In adaptation to what special conditions? With what safeguards and attention to consequences for individuals? Is it being done responsibly? Divergence is too often confused with irresponsibility (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971).

In addition to social tolerance and acceptance of the dual-career lifestyle, valuable social support networks need to be established. Suggested supports include family counseling services, parent education programs, peer support groups, women's networking associations, assertiveness training, and research and popular literature support. Publicity of the dual-career lifestyle would help people to understand the strains of coping in a socially unaccepting environment. Also needed are dual-career couples themselves to come forward and be heard on the coping strategies they employ in their multiple roles. Thus, dual-career families can become role models for each other, evolving and successfully managing their chosen lifestyle.

Dual-Career Families and the Future

A Charge for the Future

"Predicting the future is always a most delicate and difficult operation" (Reiss, 1980) but also pleasurable because it allows one to look beyond the statistics, problems, theories and strains of the "human rat-race" and imagine a different type of world. A better world is not always imagined, as in Aldous Huxley's, Brave New World (1931), but the future does

offer change, confronting us with the challenge of creating a more humane existence. Visions of the future for dual-career families "range from conservative adaptations, within the family, to social changes in institutions, employment, support networks, to revolutionary models existing within a totally restructured society, free of distinctions based on sex, age, race and class. While the former are closer to the witness of our lifetime, the latter may be the experience of those who inherit the future" (Williams, 1980).

Optimistic. In reviewing the literature on family futures, a preponderance of the views hold an optimistic analysis of the survival of the dual-career family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Lipman-Blumen, 1976; Bernard, 1973; Pickett, 1977; Sargent, 1977; Reiss, 1980; Giele, 1978; Young and Willmott, 1973). The trends of women participating in the paid labor force, declining biological sex differences and fertility rates, longer life expectancy, and increased educational attainment will become the established scenario of the future. With fewer children and more adult years to gain educational training and occupational expertise, women will continue to take their place with men in the paid workplace. "As women's work roles assume comparable importance with men's and, as their economic contribution to the family increases, women's power in decision-making roles will be strengthened" (Williams, 1980).

Symmetrical Families. A new, more egalitarian family form, the "symmetrical family" (Young and Willmott, 1973) is predicted to emerge in our post-industrial society. The phenomenon is supposed to be observable in all socio-economic stratas in the future. The symmetrical family will become increasingly more prevalent because of our rapidly changing society and uncertain circumstances, causing a high degree of flexibility in both individuals and the family system. Litwak (1970) concludes that the family of the future must adapt to a rapidly changing society.

> The one key structural need of the family--given a rapidly changing technology--is the capacity to deal with changing functions, the capacity to rapidly change what are legitimate and what are nonlegitimate activities, or most generally the capacity to be flexible.

Sex Roles. One of the main sociological consequences of flexibility in the family is the breaking down of rigid sex roles. For husbands and wives it will mean sharing the instrumental and expressive leadership in the family and expanding their life choices. For mothers, it will provide new freedoms and choices. It will offer them new horizons for education, employment, relationships, social mobility, independence and achievement in a larger world. For fathers, it offers shared responsibilities, relief of total economic and decision-making strains and an applauded chance to nurture their children and wives. For children, a more androgynous sex

role will encourage them to develop their fullest potential as human beings.

Parenting and Child-Care. As sex roles become more androgynous and less sex-typed, children will be able to more fully appreciate both parents as active participants in their lives. Thus, parenting will become a shared responsibility and no longer thought of as "women's work". Perhaps, somewhere in the distant future, mothers can retire from the role of "superwoman" and end the dictum of the struggle to live two lives. Also, child-care for employed parents would no longer be conceptualized as "a social mechanism to accommodate the changing role of women" (Levine, 1977). Instead, workers, employers, and communities would strive to resolve the issue of child-care. In that struggle to provide affordable, flexible, quality child-care, society may learn to value its greatest natural resources--our children. Hopefully, this new priority would lead to developing and up-grading child-care facilities and professionalizing early childhood work.

Institutions. All family forms, including the dual-career family, must interact with American institutions. Establishments such as churches, schools, universities, hospitals, the justice system, and governmental bureaucracies would have to restructure existing policies to accommodate working families and non-sexist language and practices. For example, schools should implement non-sexist curricula in their educational

settings and provide for equal opportunities for both boys and girls. Hospitals should continue to expand their maternity policies to include fathers not only in the delivery rooms but throughout the birthing process. Government should encourage equality in private life by enforcing equality in the public sphere of paid employment (Newland, 1980). In order for working families to interact with American institutions in a healthier, more humane manner, the system must alter its role expectations and patterns in the future.

The Workplace. The past conception of the work role has evolved from an industrial male model. To a large extent, it has been possible for men to work in modern society because of wives who subordinated their own work potential for the homemaking role. Dual-career families function without a "back-up wife", burdened with multiple roles and strains of the lifestyle. It seems necessary that a new model of the work role be developed to integrate family needs with the work system (Pleck, 1977). "The smart company that wants to tap the best people is going to have to be more flexible...and people will be more productive if we can help them solve their personal and family problems" (Schwartz, 1979).

The burden of compromise and flexibility should not lie solely with the dual-career couple. Corporations and employers need to "develop a better awareness and understanding of how work experiences and the structure of work organizations

impinge on families" (Piotrikowski, 1978). The implementation of recommendations such as job enrichment and humanization, flexible work schedules, parental leaves, part-time work opportunities, affirmative action programs, family and relocation counseling, and on-site day-care would reduce strain for many families. Employers in the future should join in a partnership with workers and families, promoting human potential, productivity, mental and physical health, creativity, satisfaction, pride and the revitalization of the American spirit of work.

Conclusion. Today's dual-career families are engaged in a microscopic experiment with social change, struggling to adapt to work and family systems which do not provide the necessary support structures. "The dual-career family is no 'freak of nature' but a forerunner of things to come and therefore useful as experiments of nature, to be studied and learned from" (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). It is important to recognize and understand the patterns of integration of work and family life, independence and interdependence of individuals, families and societies. Dual-career families provide exemplary models of a variant lifestyle aimed at expanding life choices for family members. Those who inherit the future will be charged with fostering a society where self-realization can be achieved in a multiplicity of ways. The destiny of the dual-career family pattern rests on that charge.

References

Albrecht, S.; Bahr, S.; and Chadwick, B., "Changing Family and Sex Roles...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(1), Feb. 1979, pp. 41-50.

Aldous, J., "The Search for Alternatives...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 1975, pp. 711-722.

Almquist, E., "Sex Stereotypes in Occupational Choice...," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5, 1974, pp. 13-21.

Anastasi, A. and Schaefer, C., "Biographical Correlates of Artistic and Literary Creativity...," Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 1969, pp. 267-273.

Anderson, C., "Attachment in Daily Separations...," Child Development, 51(1), 1980, pp. 242-245.

Autry, J., "Private Industry and the Family," Educational Horizons, 59(1), Fall 1980, pp. 10-14.

Bahr, E. Everybody Wins; Nobody Loses. New York: Van Rees Press, 1968.

Bahr, S., "Effects on Power and Division of Labor in the Family," pp. 167-185 in Hoffman, L. and Nye, I. (eds.). Working Mothers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Bahr, S.; Bowerman; C. and Gecas, V., "Adolescent Perceptions of Conjugal Power," Social Forces, 52, March 1974, pp. 357-367.

Bahr, S. and Day, R., "Sex Role Attitudes, Female Employment, Marital Satisfaction." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, New York, Oct. 1976.

Bales, R., in Parsons, T. and Bales, R. (eds), 1955.

Barnett, L. and MacDonald, R., "A Study of the Membership of the National Organization for Non-Parents," Social Biology, 23, Winter 1976, pp. 297-310.

Barth, E. and Watson, W., "Social Stratification and the Family in Mass Society," Social Forces, 45, March 1967, pp. 392-402.

Bebbington, A. C., "The Function of Stress in the Establishment of Dual-Career Family," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35(3), Aug. 1973, pp. 530-537.

Beckman, L., "Fertility Preferences and Social Exchange Theory," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1979.

Beckman, L. and Houser, B., "The More You Have, The More You Do...," Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 4(2), Winter 1979, pp. 160-174.

Beels, C., "The Case of the Vanishing Mommy," in Readings In Early Childhood, 1978.

Bell, C., "Mobility and the Middle-Class Extended Family," Sociology, 2(2), May 1968, pp. 173-184.

Bell, D., "Notes on the Post-Industrial Society," The Public Interest, 7(6), Winter 1970, pp. 24-35.

Bell, R. Marriage and Family Interaction. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1979.

Bem, S., "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 1974, pp. 155-162.

Bem, S. in Sprung, B. (ed.). Perspectives on Non-Sexist Early Childhood Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Benston, M., "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation," Monthly Review, 21, 1977, pp. 13-27.

Berger, M.; Foster, M.; and Wallston, B., "Finding Two Jobs," in Rapoport and Raport, 1978.

Berk, R. A. and Berk, S. F. Labor and Leisure at Home. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Pub., 1979.

Berman, E.; Sacks, S.; and Lief, H., "The Two-Professional Marriage: A New Conflict Syndrome," Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 3, 1975, pp. 242-253.

Bernard, J. The Future of Marriage. New York: Bantam, 1973.

Bernard, J. The Future of Motherhood. New York: Penguin, 1974.

Bernard, J. Women and the Public Interest. Chicago: Aldine, 1971.

Biller, H. Paternal Deprivation. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1974.

Bird, C. The Two Paycheck Marriage. New York: Rosen and Wade, 1979.

Blake, J., "Is Zero Preferred?...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(2), May 1979, pp. 245-257.

Blau, P. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Blood, R., "Long-Range Causes and Consequences of the Employment of Married Women," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, Feb. 1965, pp. 43-47.

Blood, R. and Wolfe, D. Husbands and Wives. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Blood, R., "The Husband-Wife Relationship," pp. 282-308 in Nye, I. and Hoffman, L. (eds.). The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Blood, R. and Hamblin, R., "The Effect of the Wife's Employment...," Social Forces, 36, 1958, pp. 347-352.

Booth, A. and Edwards, J., "Fathers, The Invisible Parent," Sex Roles, 6(3), June 1980, pp. 445-456.

Bott, E. Family and Social Network. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Bowlby, J. Maternal Care and Mental Health. Geneva: Health Organization, 1951.

Bradley, R., "The Renaissance of Fathering," Educational Horizons, 59(1), Fall 1980, pp. 27-33.

Brazelton, T. Infants and Mothers: Differences in Development. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Brenton, M. The American Male. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publ. Inc., 1966.

Brickman, P. Social Conflict. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1974.

Brown, S., "A Comparative Study of Maternal Employment...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Mississippi State Univ., 1970.

Bryson, J. and Bryson, R. (eds.). Dual-Career Couples. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1978.

Bryson, R.; Bryson, J.; Licht, M.; and Licht, B., "The Professional Pair...," American Psychologists, 31(1), 1976.

Burke, R. and Weir, T., "Relationship of Wives' Employment Status...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, May 1976, pp. 279-287.

Burr, W. R. Theory Construction and the Sociology of the Family. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Burr, W.; Leigh, G.; Day, R.; and Constantine, J., "Symbolic Interaction and the Family," in Burr, W.; Hill, R.; Nye, F. I.; and Reiss, I. (ed.). Contemporary Theories about the Families (Vol.2). New York: Free Press, 1979.

Caldwell, B.; Wright, C.; Honig, A.; and Tannenbaum, J., "Infant Day Care...," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40, 1970, pp. 397-412.

Campbell, A.; Converse, P.; and Rodgers, W. The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.

Campbell, A., "Women at Home and at Work," in McGuigan, D. (ed.). New Research on Women and Sex Roles. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1976.

Catalyst, in "You Work, He Works...," Glamour, Sept. 1981, p. 56.

Centers, R.; Raven, B.; and Rodrigues, A., "Conjugal Power Structure: A Re-Examination," American Sociological Review, 36, 1971, pp. 264-277.

Cherlin, A., "Work Life and Marital Dissolution," pp. 151-161 in Levinger, C. and Moles, O. (eds.). Divorce and Separation: Context and Consequences. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Clark-Stewart, K. Child Care in the Family. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Cobb, S., "Social Support as a Moderator of Life Stress," Psychosomatic Medicine, 38, Fall 1976, pp. 300-314.

Coleman, J., "Social Structure and a Theory of Action," in Blau, P. (ed.). Approaches to the Study of Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Cook, A. The Working Mother. Ithaca, N.Y.: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell Univ., 1978.

Cooper, P.; Cumber, B.; and Hartner, R., "Decision-Making Patterns and Postdecision Adjustment...," Alternative Lifestyles, 1, Feb. 1978, pp. 71-94.

Coser, R. L. and Rokoff, G. The Family: Its' Structures and Functions. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.

Cromwell, R. and Olson, D. Power In Families. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Darley, S., "Big-Time Careers for the Little Woman...," Journal of Social Issues, 32(3), 1976, pp. 85-98.

David, D. and Brannon, R. (ed.). The Forty-Nine Percent Majority. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1976.

Davidson, L. and Gordon, L. The Sociology of Gender. Chicago: Rand McNally College Pub. Co., 1979.

de Beauvoir, S. The Second Sex. New York: A. Knopf, Inc., 1970.

Defrain, J., "Androgynous Parents Tell Who They Are and What They Need," The Family Coordinator, 28(2), April 1979, pp. 237-243.

Deutsch, M. The Resolution of Conflict. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1973.

Duke, J. Conflict and Power in Social Life. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young Univ. Press, 1976.

Ekeh, P. Social Exchange: The Two Traditions. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1974.

Engles, F. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. New York: Intl. Publishers, 1971.

English, O., "The Psychological Role of the Father in the Family," Social Casework, 1954, pp. 323-329.

Epstein, C., "Law Partners and Marital Partners," Human Relations, 24, 1971, pp. 549-564.

Ericksen, J.; Yancey, W.; and Ericksen, E., "The Division of Family Roles," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(2), May 1979, pp. 301-313.

Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1963.

Etaugh, C., "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children...," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 20, 1974, pp. 71-98.

Etaugh, C., "Effects of Nonmaternal Care on Children," American Psychologist, 35(4), April 1980, pp. 309-319.

Eversoll, D., "A Two Generational View of Fathering," The Family Coordinator, 28(4), Oct. 1979, pp. 503-507.

Ewer, P.; Crimmins, E.; and Oliver, R., "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Husband's Income, Family Size and Wife's Employment...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(4), Nov. 1979, pp. 727-738.

Farkas, G., "Education, Wage Rates and the Division of Labor...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, Aug. 1978, pp. 473-483.

Fein, R., "Research on Fathering...," Journal of Social Issues, 14(1), 1978, pp. 122-135.

Firestone, S. The Dialectic of Sex. New York: William Morrow, 1970.

Fogarty, M.; Rapoport, R.; and Rapoport, R. Sex, Career and Family. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage, 1971.

Fox, G., "Another Look at the Comparative Resource Model," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 1973, pp. 18-30.

Freud, S., "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality," in Strachey, J. (ed.). The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. London: Hogarth, 1953.

Friedan, B., p. 72 in Langway et al., 1980.

Friedan, B., The Feminine Mystique. New York: Dell, 1963.

From, E., "Love Between Parent and Child," Psychology Today, Feb. 1968, pp. 52-54.

Garland, N., "The Better Half?...," in Safilios-Rothschild, C. (ed.)., 1972.

Gauger, W., "Household Work: Can We Add it to the GNP?," Journal of Home Economics, October 1973, pp. 12-23.

General Mills Inc. Families At Work. Minn., Minn.: General Mills Inc., 1981.

Giele, J. Women and the Future. New York: Free Press, 1978.

Gillespie, D., "Who Has the Power?: The Marital Struggle," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 1971, pp. 445-458.

Ginzberg, E., p. 277 in C. Bird. The Two-Paycheck Family. New York: Rawson, Wade Publishers, 1979.

Girl's Clubs of America. Today's Girl: Tomorrow's Woman. Washington, D.C.: Girl's Clubs of America, 1979.

Glick, P. and Norton, A., "Marrying, Divorcing and Living Together...," Population Reference Bureau, 32, Oct. 1977, pp. 3-28.

Glover, L. How to Give Your Child a Good Start In Life. New York: Collier Books, 1963.

Gold, D. and Andres, D., "Developmental Comparisons between Ten-Year-Old Children with Employed Mothers...," Child Development, 49, 1978, pp. 75-84.

Gold, D. and Andres, D., "Maternal Employment and Child Development...," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 10(4), 1977, pp. 20-29.

Goode, W., "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, 25, Aug. 1960, pp. 488-496.

Goode, W. J. World Revolutions and Family Patterns. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Goodrich, F. Infant Care. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Gough, G., "The Origin of the Family," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Nov. 1971, pp. 760-771.

Gouldner, A., "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement," American Sociological Review, 25, 1960, pp. 161-178.

Granovetter, M., "The Strength of Weak Ties," American Journal of Sociology, 78, May 1973, pp. 1360-1380.

Greenburg, M. and Morris, N., "The Newborn's Impact on the Father," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 44, 1974, pp. 520-533.

Gustavus, S. and Henley, J., "Correlates of Voluntary Childlessness in a Select Population," Social Biology, 18, Sept. 1971, pp. 277-284.

Hall, F. and Hall, D. The Two-Career Family. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Hand, H., "Working Mothers and Maladjusted Children," Journal of Educational Sociology, 30, 1957, pp. 245-246.

Hare-Mustin, R. and Broderick, P., "The Myth of Motherhood...," Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4(1), Fall 1979, p. 114.

Harrangue, Sr. R., "Coping, An Overview," Educational Horizons, 58(3), Spring 1980, pp. 131-133.

Hareven, 1976 in Stockard, J. and Johnson, M. Sex Roles. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

Haas, L. "Role Sharing Couples: A Study of Egalitarian Marriages," Family Relations, 29, 1980, pp. 289-296.

Haas, L., "Sexual Equality in the Family: A Study of Role Sharing Couples," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1977.

Hazen, N. Reviews of Research for Practitioners and Parents. Minn., Minn.: Univ. of Minn., 1978.

Heath, A. Rational Choice Theory and Social Exchange. New York: Cambridge, 1976.

Heckman, N.; Bryson, R.; and Bryson, J., "Problems of Professional Couples...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 1977, pp. 323-330.

Heer, D., "Measurement and Bases of Power," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 25, 1963, pp. 133-139.

Helson, R., "Effects on Sibling Characteristics and Parental Values...," Journal of Personality, 36, 1968, pp. 589-607.

Helson, R., "Women Mathematicians and the Creative Personality," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 1971, pp. 210-220.

Hess, S. Concluding Address at the White House Conference on Children and Youth, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Hill, R. Families Under Stress. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

Hill, R., "Modern Systems Theory and the Family: a Confrontation," in Sussman, M. B. (ed.). Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1974.

Hill, R. and Stafford, F., "Parental Care of Children...," Journal of Human Resources, 15(2), Spring 1980, pp. 219-239.

Hofferth, S., "Day Care in the next decade: 1980-1990," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(3), August 1979, pp. 649-657.

Hoffman, L., "Changes in Family Roles, Socialization, and Sex Differences," Educational Horizons, 57(1), Fall 1978.

Hoffman, L., "Effects on Child...," in Hoffman, L. and Nye, F. I. (eds.), 1974.

Hoffman, L., "Effects of Maternal Employment...," Developmental Psychology, 10(2), March 1974, pp. 204-228.

Hoffman, L., "Maternal Employment," American Psychologist, 34(10), Oct. 1979, pp. 859-865.

Hoffman, L., "Mother's Enjoyment of Work and Effects on the Child," in Nye, F. I. and Hoffman, L. W. (eds.), 1963.

Hoffman, L. and Nye, F. I. Working Mothers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Holmstrom, L. The Two Career Family. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenckman, 1972.

Holahan, C. and Gilbert, L., "Conflict Between Major Life Roles...," Human Relations, 32(6), 1979, pp. 451-467.

Homans, G. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1974.

Hopkins, J. and White, P., "The Dual-Career Couple: Constraints and Supports," The Family Coordinator, 27(3), July 1978, pp. 253-259.

Horner, M., "Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women," Journal of Social Issues, 28(2), 1972, pp. 157-175.

Houseknecht, S., "Reference Group Support for Voluntary Childlessness...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, May 1977, pp. 285-294.

Houseknecht, S. and Macke, A., "Combining Marriage and Career: The Marital Adjustment of Professional Women," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43(3), Aug. 1981, pp. 651-661.

Houseknecht, S. and Spanier, G., "Marital Disruption and Higher Education...," The Sociological Quarterly, 21, Summer 1980, pp. 375-389.

Houser, B. and Beckman, L., "Background Characteristics and Women's Dual-Role Attitudes," Sex Roles, 6(3), June 1980, pp. 355-366.

Hunt, J. and Hunt, L., "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status: The Case of the Dual-Career Family," Social Problems, 24(4), April 1977, pp. 407-417.

Huxley, A. Brave New World. New York: Bantam Books, 1931.

Janeway, E. Man's World, Woman's Place. New York: Delta, 1971.

Johnson, C. and Johnson, F., "Attitudes Toward Parenting in Dual-Career Families," American Journal of Psychiatry, 134(4), 1977, pp. 391-395.

Kaltreider, N. and Margolis, A., "Childless by Choice...," Journal of Psychiatry, 134, Feb. 1977, pp. 179-182.

Kandel, D. and Lesser, G., "Marital Decision-Making in America...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 1972, pp. 134-138.

Kanter, R. M. Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy. New York: Russell Sage, 1977.

Kantor, D. and Lehr, W. Inside the Family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Kelly, H. and Schenitzki, D., "Bargaining," in McClintock, G. (ed.). Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Kessler, S. and McKenna, W. Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Kohlberg, L., "A Cognitive-Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex Role Concepts and Attitudes," pp. 82-98, in Maccoby, E. (ed.). The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1966.

Kotelchuck, M., "The Infant's Relationship to the Father" in Lamb, M. (ed.), 1976.

Kugelmass, N. Wisdom with Children. New York: John Day, 1965.

Lamb, M., "The Development of Parent-Infant Attachments...," in Pederson, F., 1980.

Lamb, M., "The Development of Parental Preferences...," Sex Role, 3, 1977, pp. 495-497.

Lamb, M. (ed.). The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Lamb, M.; Owen, M.; and Chase-Lansdale, L., "The Father-Daughter Relationship...," in Kopp, C. and Kirkpatrick, M. (eds.). Becoming Female. New York: Plenum, 1979.

Langway, L.; Lord, M.; Reese, M.; Simons, P.; Maitland, T.; Gelman, E.; and Whitman, L., "The Superwoman Squeeze," Newsweek, May 19, 1980, pp. 72-79.

Langway, L.; Whitman, L.; Zabarsky, M.; and Carey, J., "A New Kind of Life with Father," Newsweek, Nov. 30, 1981, pp. 93-97.

La Rossa, R., "Negotiating Role Strain: The Transition to Parenthood," Paper presented at the Workshop on Theory Construction and Research Methodology, held at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Milwaukee, Wis., Oct. 1981.

La Rossa, R. and La Rossa, M. Transition To Parenthood. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage, 1981.

Leibowitz, L. Females, Males, Families. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1978.

Lein, L., "Male Participation in Home Life," The Family Coordinator, 28(4), Oct. 1979, pp. 489-495.

Lein, L. et al., "Final Report: Work and Family Life," National Institute of Education Project 3-3094. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for the Study of Public Policy, 1974.

LeMasters, E. Parents in Modern America. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1970.

Levine, J., "Redefining the Child-Care Problem--Men as Nurturers," Childhood Education, 54(2), Nov./Dec. 1977, pp. 55-62.

Levi-Strauss, C., "The Family ," in Skolnick, A. and Skolnick, J. (eds.). Family in Transition. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Lewis, R. and Pleck, J., "Men's Roles in the Family," The Family Coordinator, 28(4), Oct. 1979, pp. 429-432.

Lewis, R. and Spanier, G., "Theorizing About the Quality and Stability of Marriage," pp. 268-294, in Burr, W.; Hill, R.; Nye, F. I.; and Reiss, I. (eds.), 1979.

Lichtman, C., "Voluntary Childlessness...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia Univ., 1976.

Lieber, E., "The Professional Woman: Coping in a Two-Career Family," Educational Horizons, 58(3), Spring 1980, pp. 156-161.

Lipman-Blumen, J., "The Implications of Family Structure on Changing Sex Roles," Social Casework, 57, 1976, pp. 67-79.

Litwak, E., "Technological Innovation and Ideal Forms of Family Structure...," in Hill, R. and Konig, R. (eds.). Families in East and West. Paris: Mouton, 1970.

Long, B.; Henderson, E.; and Ziller, C., "Self-social Correlates of Originality in Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 111, 1967, pp. 47-57.

Lynn, D. Daughters and Parents: Past, Present and Future. Monterey, Ca.: Cole Publ. Co., 1979.

Lynn, D., "Fathers and Sex-role Development," The Family Coordinator, 25(4), Oct. 1976, pp. 403-409.

Lynn, D. The Father: His Role in Child Development. Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1974.

Lynn, D. and Cross, A., "Parent Preference of Preschool Children," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36(3), Aug. 1974, pp. 555-560.

Maccoby, E., "Women's Intellect," in Farber, S. and Wilson, R. (eds.). The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Mackey, W. and Day, R., "Some Indicators of Fathering Behaviors...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(2), May 1979, pp. 287-299.

Macklin, E., "Non-traditional Family Forms...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4), Nov. 1980, pp. 905-922.

Magarick, R., "Social and Emotional Aspects of Voluntary Childlessness...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Univ. of Maryland, 1975.

Marks, S., "Culture, Human Energy and Self-Actualization...," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 19, Summer 1979, pp. 27-42.

Marks, S., "Multiple Roles and Role Strain...," American Sociological Review, 42, Dec. 1977, pp. 921-936.

Martin, B., "Parent-Child Relations," in Hetherington, E. et al. Review of Child Development Research, Vol 4. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1975.

Martin, T.; Berry, K.; and Jacobsen, R., "The Impact of Dual-Career Marriages on Female Careers: an Empirical Test of a Parsonian Hypothesis," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 1975, pp. 734-742.

Maynard, C. and Zawacki, R., "Mobility and the Dual-Career Couple," Personnel Journal, 58(7), July 1979, pp. 468-483.

McCarthy, J. and Wolfe, D., "Doctorates Granted to Women and Minority Group Members," Science, 189, 1975, pp. 856-859.

McCubbin, H., "Integrating Coping Behavior in Family Stress Theory," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 1979, pp. 237-244.

McCubbin, H.; Joy, C.; Cauble, A.; Comeau, J.; Patterson, J.; and Needle, R., "Family Stress and Coping...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4), Nov. 1980, pp. 855-870.

McDonald, G., "Family Power: The Assessment of a Decade of Theory and Research, 1970-1979," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4), Nov. 1980, pp. 841-854.

McDonald, G., "Family Power: Reflection and Direction," Pacific Sociological Review, 20, Oct. 1977, pp. 607-621.

McLain, S. and Crawford, J. Humanity as a Career. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Merton, R., "The Role-Set...," The British Journal of Sociology, 8, June 1957, pp. 106-120.

Miller, M. Sunday's Child. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Miller, S., "Effects of Maternal Employment...," Developmental Psychology, 11(3), 1975, pp. 405-406.

Mischel, W., in Mussen, P. (ed.). Charmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. II, New York: Wiley, 1970.

Mitchel, J. Women's Estate. New York: Vintage, 1973.

Mommsen, K., "Differentials in Fertility...," Social Biology, 20, Feb. 1973, pp. 20-29.

Moore, K. and Sawhill, I. Women and the American Economy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Moore, S., "Working Mothers and Their Children," Young Children, 34(1), Nov. 1978, pp. 77-82.

Moore T., "Children of Full-time and Part-time Mothers," International Journal of Psychiatry, 2, 1964.

Moore, T., "Effects on the Children," in Yudkin, S. and Holme, A. Working Mothers and their Children. London: Michael Joseph, 1963.

Mowrer, E., "The Differentiation of Husband and Wife Roles," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 1969, pp. 534-540.

Nason, E. and Poloma, M. Voluntary Childless Couples. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Newland, K. Women, Men, and The Division of Labor. Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Institute, 1980.

Nielsen, J. Sex in Society. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1978.

Norton, E. H., p. 79 in Langway et al., 1980.

Nye, F. I. and Hoffman, L. (eds.). The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Oakley, A. The Sociology of Housework. Britain: Pitman Press, 1974.

Offit, A. in Langway, et al., 1981.

Olson, D. and Cromwell, R. Power in Families. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Oppenheimer, V., "Sociology of Women's Economic Role in the Family," American Sociological Review, 42(3), June 1977, pp. 387-406.

Ory, M., "The Decision to Parent or Not...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40(3), Aug. 1978, pp. 531-539.

Palme, O., "The Sex-Role Problem," Hertha, 2, 1975, p. 9.

Papenek, H., "Men, Women and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career," American Journal of Sociology, 78, 1973, pp. 852-872.

Parke, R., "Perspectives on Father-Infant Interaction," in Osofsky, J. (ed.). Handbook on Infant Development. New York: Wiley, 1979.

Parke, R. and O'Leary, S., "Father-Mother-Infant Interaction...," in Riegel, M. and Meacham, J. (eds.). The Developing Individual in a Changing World (Vol. II). The Hauge: Mouton, 1976.

Parrish, J., "Women in Professional Training," Monthly Labor Review, 97, May 1974, pp. 40-43.

Parsons, T. Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe: Free Press, 1954.

Parsons, T., "The Social Science of the Family," pp. 173-201 in Ansher, R. (ed.). The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R. (eds.). Family Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Pederson, F. (ed.). The Father-Infant Relationship. New York: Praeger Publ., 1980.

Pepitone-Rockwell, F. Dual-Career Couples. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1980.

Peplau, L., "Impact of Fear of Success and Sex Role Attitudes of Women's Competitive Achievement," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 1976, pp. 561-568.

Piaget, J., "Piaget's Theory," in Mussen, P. (ed.). Charmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. I. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Pickett, R., "Tomorrow's Family," Intellect, 105, April 1977, pp. 330-332.

Piers, M. Growing Up With Children. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966.

Pines, A. and Kafry, D., "The Experience of Tedium in Three Generations...," Sex Roles, 7(2), Feb. 1981, pp. 117-134.

Piotrikowski, C. Work and the Family System. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Pleck, J., "The Work-Family System," Social Problems, 24, April 1977, pp. 417-427.

Pleck, J. and Rustad, M., "Husbands' and Wives' Time in Family Work and Paid Work in the 1975-76 Study of Time Use," Working Paper. Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, 1980.

Pleck, J. and Sawyer, J. (eds.). Men and Masculinity. Englewoods Cliff, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Poloma, M., "Role Conflict and the Married Professional Woman," in Safilios-Rothschild, C. (ed.), 1972.

Poloma, M. and Garland, T., "Family Life Cycle and Career: the Dual-Career Family Revisited." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Knoxville, Tenn., March 1980.

Price-Bonham, S., "Bibliography of Literature...," The Family Coordinator, 25(4), Oct. 1976, pp. 489-512.

Radin, N., "The Role of Father...," in Lamb, M. (ed.)., 1976.

Rallings, E. and Nye, F. I., "Wife-Mother Employment, Family and Society," pp. 203-226 in Burr, W.; Hill, R.; Nye, F. I.; and Reiss, I. (eds.), 1979.

Rapoport, R., "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Studies of Marriage and the Family," in Chetwynd, J. and Hartnett, O. The Sex Role System. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Dual-career Families. Baltimore: Penguin, 1971.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., "Dual-Career Families: Progress and Prospects," Marriage and Family Review, 1(5), 1978, pp. 1-12.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., "Further Considerations on the Dual-Career Family," Human Relations, 24, 1972, pp. 519-533.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., "The Dual-Career Family: A Variant Pattern and Social Change," Human Relations, 22, 1969, pp. 3-30.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., "Three Generations of Dual-Career Family Research," pp. 23-48, in Pepitone-Rockwell, F. (ed.), 1980.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R., "Work and Family in Contemporary Society," American Sociological Review, 30, 1965, pp. 381-394.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. Working Couples. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Reiss, I. Family Systems In America. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Renshaw, J. R., "An Exploration of the Dynamics of the Overlapping Worlds of Work and Family Life," Family Process, 15, 1976, pp. 143-165.

Rhee, J., "Trends and Variations in Childlessness in the U.S." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Univ. of Georgia, 1973.

Ribble, M. The Rights of Infants. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965.

Ricciuti, H., "Fear and the Development of Social Attachments," in Lewis, M. and Rosenblum, L. (eds.). The Origins of Fear. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Rice, D. Dual-Career Marriage. New York: Free Press, 1979.

Ritchey, P. and Stokes, C., "Correlates of Childlessness and Expectations to Remain Childless," Social Forces, 52, March 1974, pp. 349-356.

Robinson, J. P. How Americans Use Time: A Social-Psychological Analysis of Everyday Behavior. New York: Praeger, 1977.

Roland, A. and Harris, B. Career and Motherhood. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Rollins, B. and Bahr, S., "A Theory of Power Relationship in Marriage," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38(4), Nov. 1976, pp. 619-627.

Roslow, J. and Rose, K., "Divorce Among Doctors," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 1972, pp. 587-598.

Ross, H. and Sawhill, I. Time of Transition. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1975.

Rossi, A., "Transition to Parenthood," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 1968, pp. 26-39.

Rouman, J., "School Children's Problems as Related to Parental Factors," Journal of Educational Research, 50, 1956, pp. 105-112.

Rubin, J. and Brown, B. The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Safilios-Rothschild, C., "A Macro-and Micro-Examination of Family Power and Love: An Exchange Model," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 1976, pp. 355-362.

Safilios-Rothschild, C., "The Study of Family Power Structure: A Review 1960-1969," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31(4), Nov. 1970, pp. 290-301.

Safilios-Rothschild, C. Toward a Sociology of Women. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox College Publ., 1972.

Sargent, A. Beyond Sex Roles. New York: West Publ. Co., 1977.

Sawin, D. and Parke, R., "Fathers' Affectionate Stimulation...," The Family Coordinator, 28(4), Oct. 1979, pp. 509-513.

Scanzoni, J. Opportunity and the Family. New York: Free Press, 1970.

Scanzoni, J., "Sex Role Change and Influences on Birth Intentions," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 1976, pp. 43-60.

Scanzoni, J., "Sex Roles, Economic Factors, and Marital Solidarity...," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 1975, pp. 130-144.

Scanzoni, J. Sex Roles, Lifestyles and Childbearing. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Scanzoni, J. Sex Roles, Women's Work, and Marital Conflict. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1979.

Scanzoni, J., "Social Exchange and Behavioral Interdependence," in Huston, T. and Burgess, R. (eds.). Social Exchange in Developing Relationships. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Scanzoni, J., "Social Processes and Power in Families," pp. 295-316 in Burr, W. R.; Hill, R.; Nye, F.; and Reiss, I. (eds.), 1979.

Scanzoni, L. and Scanzoni, J. Men, Women and Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.

Schwartz, F., p. 79 in Langway et al., 1979.

Schwartz, J., "Reconciling Women's Changing Status...," Educational Horizons, 59(1), Fall 1980, pp. 15-21.

Schwartz, J., "Two faces of Janus: Women As Parents and Providers," Educational Horizons, 58(3), Spring 1980, pp. 162-168.

Secombe, W., "The Housewife and Her Labour under Capitalism," New Left Review, 83, 1974, pp. 3-24.

Sexton, R. The Feminized Male. New York: Random House, 1969.

Sieber, S., "Toward a Theory of Role Accumulation," American Sociological Review, 39, Aug. 1974, pp. 567-578.

Siegel, A. and Haas, M., "The Working Mother...," Child Development, 34, 1963, pp. 513-542.

Skinner, D., "Dual-Career Family Stress and Coping...," Family Relations, 29(4), Oct. 1980, pp. 473-481.

Smuts, R. Women and Work in America. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1974.

Spock, B. Baby and Child Care (1st ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster, 1946.

Spock, B. Baby and Child Care (2nd ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967.

Sokoloff, N., "Motherwork and Working Mothers," Quest, 5(3), 1981, pp. 41-49.

Sprey, J., "Family Power and Process...," in Cromwell, R. and Olson, D. (eds.).

St. John-Parson, D., "Continuous Dual-Career Families...," pp. 30-42 in Bryson, J. and Bryson, R. (eds.), 1978.

Staines, G.; Pleck, J.; Shepard, L.; and O'Connor, P., "Wives' Employment Status...," pp. 90-120 in Bryson, J. and Bryson, R. (eds.), 1978.

Steinem, G., p. 73 in Langway et al., 1980.

Steinmetz, S. and Straus, M. (eds.). Violence in the Family. New York: Dodd/Mead, 1974.

Stockard, J. and Johnson, M. Sex Roles. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

Stokes, R. and Hewitt, J., "Aligning Actions," American Sociological Review, 41, Oct. 1976, pp. 836-849.

Stolz, L., "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children...," Child Development, 31, 1960, pp. 749-782.

Sullivan, S. A. The Fathers' Almanac. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1980.

Swartz, J., "Reconciling Women's Changing Status with Children's Enduring Needs," Educational Horizons, 59(1), Fall 1980, pp. 15-21.

Szalai, A., "Report of the Secretary-General, The Situation of Women in the Light of Contemporary...," U.N. World Conference of Intl. Women's Year, Mexico City, June 19-July 2, 1975.

Teicholz, J., "A Preliminary Search for Psychological Correlates...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston Univ., 1977.

Theodore, A. (ed.). The Professional Woman. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publ. Co., Inc., 1971.

Thoen, G., "Commitment Among Voluntary Childless Couples...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Univ. of Minnesota, 1977.

Thomson, E., "The Value of Employment to Mothers of Young Children," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(3), Aug. 1980, pp. 551-566.

Tognoli, J., "The Flight from Domestic Space: Men's Roles in the Household," The Family Coordinator, 28(4), Oct. 1979, pp. 599-645.

Trist, E., "Urban North America: The Challenge of the Next Thirty Years," Keynote Address to the Annual Conference of the Town Planning Institute of Canada, June 1968, Tavistock Institute, H.R.C. Document no. 153.

Turner, J. The Structure of Sociological Theory. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1974.

Turner, R., "Role-taking: Process-vs-Conformity," in Rose, A. (ed.). Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Fertility Expectations of American Women. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, (100th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.

U.S. Children's Bureau. Infant Care (1st ed.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Commissioner of Labor. Fourth Annual Report: Working Women in Large Cities. Washington, D.C., 1900, pp. 62-64.

U.S. Dept. of Labor. Employment in Perspective: Working Women. Report 565 (1), Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.

U.S. Dept. of Labor, in Girl's Clubs of America, 1979.

Van Dusen, R. and Sheldon, E., "The Changing Status of American Women: A Life Cycle Perspective," The American Psychologist, 31, Feb. 1976, pp. 106-116.

Vanek, J., "Keeping Busy: Time Spent in Housework...," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Univ. of Michigan, 1973.

Vanek, J., "Time Spent in Housework," Scientific American, Nov. 1974, pp. 116-120.

Van Fossen, B., "Sexual Stratification and Sex-Role Socialization," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39(3), Aug. 1977, pp. 563-574.

Veevers, J., "The Life-Style of Voluntary Childless Couples" in Larson, L. (ed.). The Canadian Family in Comparative Perspective. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Veevers, J., "Voluntary Childlessness: A Review of Issues...," Marriage and Family Review, 2, Summer 1979, pp. 1-26.

Waldman, E. and Whitmore, R., "Children of Working Mothers," Monthly Labor Review, 97, May 1974, pp. 50-58.

Walker, K. and Woods, M. Time Use: A Measure of Household Production of Family Goods and Services. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economic Assoc., 1976.

Weathers, D., "How Other Countries Cope," Newsweek, May 18, 1979, p. 76.

Weinbaum, B. and Bridges, A., "The Other Side of the Paycheck: Monopoly Capital and the Structure of Consumption," Monthly Review, 28, 1976, pp. 88-103.

Weitz, S. Sex Roles. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977.

Werts, C. and Watley, D., "Parental Influence on Talent Development," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19, 1972, pp. 367-373.

Whitehurst, C. Women In America: The Oppressed Majority. Santa Monica, Ca.: Goodyear Publication Co., Inc., 1977.

Whiting, B., "Work and the Family: Cross-Cultural Perspectives," Invitational Conference on Women, Radcliffe Institute, Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Williams, J., "Equality and the Family," International Journal of Women's Studies, 3(2), Spring 1980, pp. 131-142.

Wolfe, D., 1959 in Brown, B., "Wife-Employment and the Emergence of Egalitarian Marital Role Prescriptions," Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 9(1), Spring 1978, pp. 5-16.

Women on Words and Images. Dick and Jane as Victims: Sex Stereotyping in Children's Readers. Princton, N. J.: WWI Press, 1975.

Women's Bureau. Working Mothers and Their Children. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1977.

Wright, J., "Are Working Women Really More Satisfied," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, May 1978, pp. 301-313.

Yarrow, M., "Maternal Employment and Child Rearing," Children, 8, 1961, pp. 223-228.

Young, M. and Wilmott, P. The Symmetrical Family. London: Penguin, 1973.

Zelditch, M., "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study," in Parsons, T. and Bales, R. (eds.). Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: Free Press, 1955.